

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER  
REMEMBERS THE EARLY  
YEARS OF YOUNG AMERICANS  
FOR FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the founders and the second national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom, I was pleased to join with a large group of friends of YAF last Saturday at their 20th anniversary dinner here in Washington.

As the national YAF chairman during the 1964 Presidential election, I can tell you the important role played by our colleague from Arizona, BARRY GOLDWATER, both as a fighter for the conservative cause and an inspiration to us all.

Without Senator GOLDWATER, there would have been no conservative movement, and I would like to share his thoughts on the early years of YAF which appear in the current issue of YAF's publication, the New Guard.

The article follows:

YAF AND THE EARLY YEARS

(By Barry Goldwater)

It doesn't seem possible that two decades have passed since Young Americans for Freedom came into being. I well remember that Autumn day twenty years ago when I first heard about the conference at the Buckley Estate in Sharon, Connecticut. If memory serves me, the first full report I received was from my friend Bill Buckley, and it was an enthusiastic account of some young activists who wanted to have a say in their generation's future.

There were a number of things about the Sharon conference I found highly encouraging. First there was the Sharon Statement itself, outlining the purposes of the new organization in what was developing into a nationwide crusade for freedom based on sound Constitutional principles and limited government. It spelled out unmistakably the need for individual liberty and national strength. It provided a platform which could be used to appeal to a broad spectrum of the nation's youth. In the second place I found the organization's insistence on political nonpartisanship to be healthy and appealing. Although the conservative tenets were largely being espoused by Republicans, I knew from experience in my own state of Arizona that a large number of young Democrats were being more and more drawn to the sound Constitutional arguments that we were beginning to set forth. In the third place, I was glad that the name Young Americans for Freedom was agreed upon at Sharon. At that time, too many organizations were springing up containing the word "conservative." It was my feeling that to be effective, a young activist organization would need a broader appeal and something with a patriotic ring. And, certainly, the word "freedom" was basic and fundamental to everything we were trying to accomplish.

Needless to say in those early days, I enthusiastically lent my name to YAF. I felt the start made at Sharon augured well for the future. In my travels throughout the country and especially in my appearances before high school and college groups, I had become fully aware that some kind of a unifying organization was needed to give expression to the rapidly growing enthusiasm for conservative principles among the young people of the nation. Indeed, a number of groups did exist, but it was obvious to me that some kind of catch-all organization was sorely needed and I hoped that YAF would fill that bill.

To say that YAF got off to a fast start is to put it mildly. I had hardly gotten used to the idea when I was invited to be the principal speaker at a public YAF gathering in New York City's Manhattan Center, scheduled for March of 1961. This was barely five months after the founding of the organization and, realizing that the Manhattan Center had the capacity of 3000, I frankly felt my young friends had bitten off more than they could chew. I recalled that less than 100 people had attended the Sharon Conference and naturally I wondered how they were going to turn out any kind of significant crowd. Well, the answer to that is now history. YAF's First Annual Awards Rally drew 6000 wildly screaming conservatives, only half of whom could actually get into the meeting hall. I remember that occasion very well because I shared the spotlight with some famous names, among them William F. Buckley, Jr., Taylor Caldwell, Russell Kirk, George Sokolsky, and Eugene C. Pulliam. If I remember correctly, I addressed my audience as "the nation's young leaders of tomorrow," and I must say that I didn't at that time realize how prophetic my words would turn out to be.

Actually, it was on that night in 1961 that Young Americans for Freedom became a recognized national institution. The rally attracted an enormous amount of media attention. An account of it was carried on page 1 of the New York Times and the television networks carried film clips of the proceedings. Perhaps my own attendance at a time of increasing public attention to conservative causes helped bring this about. If so, I count it as one of the major achievements of my public life.

A year later, when I learned that my young friends were planning their Second Annual Awards Rally in Madison Square Garden, I again experienced a degree of skepticism. I wondered if the YAF leaders actually realized what they were up against. It is one thing to fill an auditorium with 3000 people and quite another to put on a show in a hall with a capacity of 19,000. Again, I should have known better. The young conservatives filled the Garden and produced more enthusiasm for the conservative cause than anyone had ever seen before. I believe that was the night that I predicted that "a new wave of conservatism" would eventually triumph in America. As we all know, it did not triumph in 1964—but it is likely to triumph in 1980.

With that rally at Madison Square Garden, YAF really moved into high gear. From then on, every significant conservative action throughout the country bore some trace of YAF involvement. It was about this time that the "Draft Goldwater" movement began to take on some strength and this gave YAF people a constantly

moving vehicle with which to work. Although I did not attend, I was well aware of the Draft Goldwater Rally which was staged in Washington in July 1963 and I was amazed at the job the YAFers did in this operation. Hundreds of them from all over the country poured into Washington and put on such a demonstration that even a reluctant media could not ignore it.

And, this was the beginning of intensive YAF activity throughout my entire campaign for the Presidency in 1964. YAF members were active everywhere. I saw them at airports, shopping centers, college campuses, and meeting halls in every primary state, and I found them swelling the crowds and the enthusiasm at every stop I made during my general election campaign. It is hard for me to estimate the kind of debt I owe to those early leaders of YAF who organized so actively and so well throughout the entire country.

And, if there is one thing I take satisfaction in, it is the amount of youth activity in the 1964 campaign. The cause was a losing one and most of my supporters knew it long before the votes were counted. But the young people in my campaign seemed to sense that they were laying the groundwork for future battles and victories in the conservative cause. And, I believe this has been the case. The seeds for conservative political activity which were laid in 1964—and in large part by the young people—are bearing fruit today. Those efforts established the conservative cause—and it is here to stay.

Everyone who reads this magazine knows that what began in Sharon, Connecticut 20 years ago today has become a major force to be reckoned with in the political life of this nation. I feel a great measure of pride every time I encounter a leader in politics, in business, or in the newsgathering profession who cut his teeth in YAF. And their numbers are growing. I am amazed at YAF's input into the leadership ranks of this nation, and I believe this is only the beginning.

In conclusion, let me say that I am proud to have played a role in the early days of Young Americans for Freedom. On this, the 20th Anniversary of its founding, I salute that organization and predict a great future for it.●

RONALD REAGAN'S COMMENTS  
ON YOUNG AMERICANS FOR  
FREEDOM

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, this month is the 20th anniversary of the founding of Young Americans for Freedom, on whose national advisory board I have the honor to serve. This month's issue of YAF's magazine, New Guard, contains an article by my good friend, Ronald Reagan, looking back on YAF's history.

There is no doubt that Governor Reagan's leadership in the conservative movement has encouraged many thousands of young people to rally to the cause by joining YAF.

At this point in my remarks I include Governor Reagan's thoughts on the 20th anniversary of YAF.

The article follows:

**YAF: 20 YEARS OF CONSERVATIVE LEADERSHIP**  
(By Ronald Reagan)

Twenty years ago, the United States entered the tumultuous decade of the 1960s. It was a time of tension, of turmoil, of trial for many of America's most cherished beliefs and most venerated institutions.

We remember the Sixties for many things. But chief among them were the extent to which Americans came to regard political action as the pathway to fulfillment of virtually every desire of the human heart, and the obeisance America's opinionmakers paid to America's youth. Young people were seen not simply as a repository of energy, idealism and enthusiasm, but of political wisdom and virtue as well. A generation of parents nearly convinced itself it was their duty not so much to teach their children as to be instructed by them.

As could be expected with such notions rampant, the news media lionized the activities and the goals of the young people who believed constructive social change is accomplished through sit-in demonstrations and protest marches. The groups which advocated the most radical changes by the most drastic means—the Students for a Democratic Society, the Yippies, the Black Panthers, the Weathermen, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the New Mobilization—became household words. Their leaders became overnight celebrities. Their agendas were treated with respect in high government and academic circles.

There was another group of young people who banded together in 1960 to form a political organization, but this group did not receive the attention the news media showered upon the left-wing activists. The 90 young men and women who gathered in Bill Buckley's backyard in Sharon, Connecticut in the autumn of 1960 were thought of—when they were thought of at all—as something of an anomaly, if not an anachronism.

While many of the more publicized youth organizations were demanding replacement of America's capitalist economy with one or another form of socialism, Young Americans for Freedom was saying the only thing wrong with our free enterprise system was that it wasn't free enough.

While many of the more publicized youth organizations insisted that the moral superiority of their cause overrode mere statutes, Young Americans for Freedom maintained that ours is a government of laws, not men, and that the liberty of one individual or group is secure only so long as all respect the rights of others who disagree with them.

While many of the more publicized youth organizations calumniated the United States as the greatest threat to peace in the world, Young Americans for Freedom resolutely declared that Communism was humanity's greatest enemy, and that the world will not know true peace until Communist expansion has been checked.

The Sixties and the early Seventies were a fiery cauldron from which came burnished steel. Many of our college campuses—and some of our high schools—were turned into ideological battlefields and Young Americans for Freedom usually were outnumbered, but rarely outfought.

During this trying period, YAF performed three invaluable services:

First, through its publications and speakers at everything from chapter meetings to national conventions, YAF provided consi-

derent young Americans with a sound education in the fundamental principles of American democracy, an education sadly lacking in the classrooms of too many of our colleges and universities.

Second, on many campuses where much of the faculty and the administration sympathized with the left-wing activists, and where "Establishment" spokesmen feared to tread, Young Americans for Freedom was often the only voice raised in defense of the traditional concept of academic freedom, and in support of the basic objectives of United States foreign policy.

Finally, through Young Americans for Freedom, a generation of young people received a priceless education in practical political action. Working in everything from campus elections to national political campaigns, YAFers have learned how to get things done in a democratic society.

Twenty years have passed since the Sixties began, and the left-wing activist groups that were hailed then as "the wave of the future" have faded, lamented, into the footnotes of history.

But Young Americans for Freedom endures. The principles enumerated in the Sharon Statement, which seemed so anachronistic then, are being looked upon with new respect by many who once made fun of them. With 80,000 members in 500 chapters in virtually every state in the union, YAF has become the largest, and most effective, political youth organization in America. With an aggressive program of member education, activism, and outreach, YAF continues to prepare conscientious young Americans for leadership roles an earlier generation of YAFers already are assuming.

Representative Bob Bauman of Maryland, who in a few short years has earned the sobriquet "conscience of the House," is perhaps YAF's most famous alumnus. But he is by no means alone. Congressman Phil Crane, who impressed so many in his bid for the Republican nomination for President this year, was a YAF member in college. Stan Evans, who wrote so much of the stirring Sharon Statement, is a nationally syndicated columnist and a commentator for CBS radio. Many YAF alumni hold elective office in state and local governments, and many more hold key positions on the staffs of prominent state and federal officeholders. A number of former YAFers, headed by past Executive Director Frank Donatelli, are assisting me in my campaign. A former YAF National Chairman, David Keene, is the able political director for my running mate, George Bush.

I've enjoyed a special relationship with Young Americans for Freedom for many years. It's been my pleasure to serve on YAF's national advisory board, and to address YAF's biennial national convention and many state and regional YAF gatherings as well.

I look forward to my opportunities to exchange ideas with the members of Young Americans for Freedom. It's always an invigorating experience for me. Your energy, enthusiasm, and faith in the future of our country is the best possible tonic for an old warhorse. It is when I'm among young people like those in YAF that I am most forcefully reminded that what makes America different from other nations is that we're always looking forward, and never backward. For us, the glories of our past—and it's been a glorious past—are but a faint foretaste of the glories to come, a warm glow like the light of early morning that precedes the rising of the sun.

America, and Young Americans for Freedom, are entering a new decade together. It will be a decade of fearsome challenges. Twenty years of meddling from Washington

have slowed our once vibrant economy to a virtual standstill. Our defenses, once second to none, have become second to the Soviet Union, and are falling further behind. Repairing all this damage will not be easy, and cannot be accomplished overnight. There are many long hours that need to be worked, many sacrifices that have to be made.

But Americans, and especially Young Americans for Freedom, have always had a clear understanding of the road America was destined to travel. Our land was not intended to be for ourselves alone, but to be a great beacon of hope to the poor and the downtrodden all over the globe. It is our God-given task to be a shining example to all the world of what free men, living in peace, can accomplish.

We have traveled far in 204 years, but not yet far enough. America's greatest opportunities and greatest challenges lie before us. We have promises to keep, and miles to go before we sleep. Americans, and especially Young Americans for Freedom, are eager to undertake the journey. ●

**BOB AND CAROL BAUMAN;  
FOUNDERS OF YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM**

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago this month, Young Americans for Freedom was founded by a small group of young conservatives at the estate of William F. Buckley, Jr., in Sharon, Conn., my good friend and editor of National Review. Today it has grown to include many thousands of members all across America.

Last Saturday evening in Washington a 20th anniversary dinner was held at the Mayflower Hotel and nearly 1,000 YAF leaders, members, advisers, and supporters turned out to celebrate this important milestone of American conservatism.

As part of a special 20th anniversary edition of YAF's publication, the New Guard, our colleague from Maryland, BOB BAUMAN, and his wife Carol, wrote an article reminiscing about the founding of YAF. Having read it, I suspect it is mostly Carol's work since it is such a well-balanced and reasonable account of that day in history.

As a salute to YAF and to Bob and Carol BAUMAN, leaders of the conservative movement, I include the article from the New Guard at this point in my remarks:

**OUR TWENTY YEARS WITH YAF**

Probably the high point for us at the July 1980 Republican National Convention was being greeted on arrival at Detroit's airport by 30 or 40 YAFers. Stepping off the plane from Baltimore, as part of the Maryland delegation, we were surprised to hear chants of "Bauman, Bauman" and then startled to see scores of youthful smiling faces, bright-eyed with enthusiasm, waving placards proclaiming "YAF Loves Bauman."

The thrill was not so much the flattery in the greeting, nor the satisfaction it gave as other members of our delegation took in the little scene. It was the recognition that,



twenty years ago, that would have been us. We would have been there, too, carrying our signs, filled with excitement. To know that we have been part of that movement brought lumps to our throats.

Attending the Twentieth Anniversary Dinner of YAF can be compared to the shock parents face when that cute little toddler, so precocious and lovable, suddenly graduates from high school, becomes an adult, and even towers over you. Where did all those years go? Did we do a good job raising him, and can he cope with the world?

Such a shock can send a parent into fond reminiscences about those early years. So it is with YAF. We can hardly believe it's been so many years ago.

In 1959, College Young Republicans in the Washington, D.C. area were divided into two camps, much like their elders. The liberal camp talked party unity but systematically excluded conservatives. We conservatives, who considered ourselves intellectually superior, were backing Richard Nixon as the only realistic alternative to Nelson Rockefeller. We enjoyed the YR struggles, but only as a means to assert conservatism as the authentic philosophy of the party.

Some went in for single issue causes, like The Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath, or fighting the influence of the U.S. National Student Association.

Liberal domination of schools, media, government, and student institutions was so pervasive that to be an active conservative was to be a rebel—in truth, a radical.

Into that environment stepped a crew-cut Bob Bauman, Georgetown University student, and Carol Dawson, Dunbarton College student and ardent believer in principle. Both were presidents of their respective campus YR clubs. They met at the 1959 D.C. College YR convention held at the Georgetown campus. Along with a variety of other rebels, they began a long struggle to identify and assert their political views.

Bob worked on the minority staff of the House of Representatives, and was just entering Georgetown Law School. Carol held a part-time job in the office of Vice President Richard Nixon during her senior year, and that summer was elected College Service Committee national co-chairman (along with the late Bill Steiger of Wisconsin) of the Young Republicans.

Filled with zeal, they wanted to form a national Youth for Nixon to work in the 1960 Presidential campaign. This they accomplished, and Carol was hired by the Nixon campaign to run the project out of national headquarters.

The New Conservatism was already abuzz across the nation. Barry Goldwater's book *The Conscience of a Conservative* was being widely read, and conservatives had been succeeding in varying degrees in gaining control of the YRs.

One problem stymied them. Party regulars were constantly yapping at their heels, forcing them to "tone down" their comments in GOP publications, refusing them party positions if they were suspected of being too right wing. And would-be President Nixon lent little outward support to his conservative friends.

What we need, they and their cohorts decided, is a national conservative youth organization that is not merely a debating club, but an activist group, not held down by the constraints of Republican Party neutrality on the really crucial issues.

Into that circle stepped David Franke, just up from Houston, Texas, and interning at Human Events, Doug Caddy, a student at Georgetown who was also editor of *The Foreign Service Courier*, and Yale graduate and

Human Events editor M. Stanton Evans. The idea took hold.

Carol was working full time with the Nixon clubs. Her contacts with the college YRs and Nixon activists on campus added up to a hefty mailing list.

Doug and Dave had their own list of members of the National Student Committee for a Loyalty Oath. And the Midwest Symphony Orchestra of college YRs, led by Chicago's Bob Croll, was a breeding ground for some real GOP rebels.

At the Chicago Republican National Convention, a little-publicized meeting was arranged, planned and chaired by Doug Caddy with the help of Marvin Liebman, publicist and friend of Bill Buckley and Bill Rusher. It was the first meeting of the National Committee for a Conservative Youth Organization. A major convocation was set for September, 1960, at the Buckley estate in Sharon, Connecticut.

It is a myth that Bob Bauman attended the Sharon Conference. He was too busy back in the First Congressional District of Maryland working for the reelection of his political mentor, Ted Miller, who was trying for a comeback after a 1958 defeat. It was Carol, who, though still part of the Nixon campaign, participated at Sharon, and, some say, had a part in the workshop which produced the Sharon Statement. (It was really written by Stan Evans, but out of respect for democratic procedure, was duly rewritten by a committee.)

Credit for the name Young Americans for Freedom, by the way must be given Lee Edwards, now of his own P. R. firm, Lee Edwards and Associates. The name itself softened the term "conservative," which, it was felt, was not yet sufficiently acceptable. The term "freedom," it was decided, should not be allowed to be claimed exclusively by the left wing.

From then until now, the lives of Bob and Carol Bauman (we eventually married, November 19, 1960) have been closely tied to Young Americans for Freedom and the conservative movement.

To reminisce on YAF's twentieth anniversary is to recall both warm and painful memories. There were long, bitter fights at board meetings (yes, folks, those are nothing new!). There were pressures of trying to earn a living, start a family, continue in school, and maintain the struggle against liberalism all at the same time.

But they were also days of great excitement and challenge. How proud we were of *New Guard*! At those late night meetings at our house or at Lee Edwards' Capitol Hill apartment, we fought just as heatedly over page make-up and type styles as we did over editorial policy.

In New York City, YAF groups became so strong that the great Governor Nelson Rockefeller, still harboring hopes for the GOP presidential nomination, invited national YAF officials to a closed door meeting at this Fifth Avenue office. Carol recalls today how much fun it was to poke and probe at Rockefeller's views on welfarism, accommodation with the Soviets, and social issues.

There were rallies, perhaps the most memorable one being the 1962 Madison Square Garden Rally at which we had planned to honor Moise Tshombe, the anti-Communist leader of Katanga Province in the Congo. (The State Department refused him a visa, an action which we challenged in court, but lost.)

At that rally, there was an electrifying speech by L. Brent Bozell, a tumultuous response to Barry Goldwater, and a massive turnout of youthful conservatives that surprised even the *New York Times*.

Then there was the move of YAF headquarters to 514 C St. N.E. in Washington, and the addition of Richard Viguerie as Executive Director.

There was the very successful anti-National Students Association (NSA) campaign, which became STOP NSA, and the campaign against the Test Ban Treaty, and the boycott of U.S. companies trading with the Soviets.

Also memorable was the 1963 YAF convention at Fort Lauderdale, where Senator Strom Thurmond thrilled us with an hour-and-a-half speech on Constitutional government.

Along with all of this there was growth—even greater growth than we could have imagined, especially after the 1964 Goldwater defeat. Then there was the tragic death of young Bob Schuchman, our first national chairman. Schuchman, a New Yorker, was widely regarded as an intellectual giant. Some of his thoughts, written on the occasion of the second anniversary of YAF, still seem appropriate:

"... a great awakening has occurred in our land, a new awareness that the pat solutions and overwrought clichés of the liberals who govern America do not come to grips with the crucial problems we face as a . . . [conservatives] are, at last, approaching the state of political maturity. We can now leave pettiness behind, and concentrate on effectuating our ideals: understanding them, promoting them, insuring that they gain political success. We must do this because the philosophy of conservatism is to survive; and only if the West and its institutions survive will freedom continue to exist on this earth."

Of course the more successful YAF became, the more it was attacked. Harvard Young Republicans founded *Advance*, a liberal counterpart of the *New Guard*, as well as the Ripon Society, a kind of elitist group to promote the likes of Rockefeller, Lindsay, and Javits.

Group Research, Inc., a far-left organization funded by labor union money, surfaced to document YAF and other "far-right" groups by proving that we all were either "dangerous" or really didn't exist except on paper.

When that didn't work, every attempt was made to smear YAF with the broad brush of guilt by association. The John Birch Society, which never enjoyed a respectable reputation, was said by some of our enemies to be closely allied with YAF. We were "hot eyed radicals," according to a *Baltimore Sun* columnist. Another termed us "well-heeled sons and daughters of the upper middle class."

It got so bad that we became a little paranoid. When the horrible news came out of Dallas that President John F. Kennedy had been shot, YAF officers rushed to the card file (we didn't have computers then) to see if by chance a Lee Harvey Oswald had ever been a YAF member. Absurd, of course, because Oswald was never identified as a conservative, but as a Communist sympathizer. But that's what unrelenting attacks by a biased media can do even to well-balanced young conservatives.

The amazing thing was that YAF groups really did exist on college campuses, in high schools, and in cities and towns throughout the nation.

There is a lot to be said for YAF after twenty years. It has enjoyed much success in the political wars, much growth (even staying afloat these days is a major miracle), and provided much valuable experience for the young men and women who first got their feet wet politically through YAF.

For us, one of the major benefits has been personal. Not just that Bob has succeeded in becoming a Congressman, and a national conservative spokesman. And not just that our cause grows and now we face the delicious prospect of winning the Presidency. But mainly that we have made so many friends.

Some of them, like Schuchman, are no longer with us. We are grateful to such men as the late Frank Meyer and Willmoore Kendall for enriching our minds and our hearts, and to brave leaders like Dean Clarence Manion and Gov. Charles Edison who carried on the fight before we were born. But most of all, we are grateful for our contemporaries, who are still in there fighting.

At the GOP national convention, recognizing old friends, many of whom were convention delegates, working in the media, or working for the candidates, suggests that this business of conservative politics isn't all mailing lists and board meetings. It is also people, good friends, trusted allies, comrades in the cause.

We are sure other old YAFers get the same nostalgic feeling when they encounter their peers. Helen and Alan MacKay, Dave and Carlyn Keene, Jameson and Carolyn Campaigne, Jim and Josie Linen, Diarmuid O'Scannlain, Bill and Lynn Schulz, Allan and Jamie Ryskind, Lee and Anne Edwards, Don and Ann Devine, Dave and Corinne Jones, and scores of others, are treasured friends.

Would things have been different today had YAF not been born twenty years ago this year? Decidedly so, in our opinion. There seems little probability that after the 1964 Goldwater defeat, youthful conservatism could have survived without the organizational and ideological strength provided by YAF. If YAF had not been founded in 1960, by those of us now in our forties, it most certainly would have to be founded today by those of you yet in your teens and twenties.

To quote William F. Buckley, Jr., writing on YAF's founding:

"A new organization was born last week and just possibly it will influence the political future of this country, as why should it not, considering that its membership is young, intelligent, articulate, and determined, its principles enduring, its aim to translate those principles into political action in a world which has lost its moorings and is looking about for them desperately?"

#### COOPERATION IN IMPLEMENTATION OF SUPERFUND LEGISLATION

**HON. W. J. "BILLY" TAUZIN**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has acted favorably with regard to H.R. 7020, the Hazardous Waste Containment Act of 1980. I, too have voted for this legislation, but wish to express here certain reservations with regard to the manner in which this act may ultimately be implemented. In considering H.R. 7020, this body saw fit to reject an amendment offered to grant Congress veto power over any final rules promulgated by the EPA Administrator. We have, therefore, delegated all responsibility for interpretation of our intent to EPA. Many

sections of H.R. 7020 require the EPA to coordinate with the States in applying the act's terms to the conditions which may exist within each such State, all according to abandoned site programs drawn up by States and approved by the EPA.

Louisiana has already established abandoned site legislation and State funding in the amount of \$1.6 million to begin remedial efforts to clean up these sites. We have conducted surveys and we have instituted strict penalties and reporting requirements. It is my hope that the EPA, under the terms of H.R. 7020, will work cooperatively with Louisiana in order that both entities will be able to carry out their responsibilities in an efficient manner under their respective authorizations. It is not the intent of H.R. 7020 that the EPA should override State authority where a State has already acted responsibly to address the problem of abandoned hazardous waste sites. Rather, it is clear that this Congress intends to accord to each State the sovereign right to make those decisions with regard to this subject, which it determines are in the best interest of its citizens. Little good will be accomplished if the EPA requires a State such as Louisiana, which is already responding to the problem, to take two steps backward while EPA and many of the other States try to catch up. States with ongoing programs should be encouraged to maintain their leadership and initiative on this sensitive issue. I trust that the EPA will consider such a perspective in implementing H.R. 7020 as finally adopted.

#### ENERGY AND THE POOR

**HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, for the poor and low-income residents of this Nation, the continuing energy crisis presents formidable burdens. These citizens' inability to take advantage of energy tax credits, coupled with their difficulties in meeting basic needs, make the energy burden unusually difficult. The Congress has responded to the unique needs of the poor in the face of an energy crisis by passing such measures as the Low Income Energy Assistance Act. However, much work remains in this area. I would like to share a very fine speech given recently by Maryland State Delegate Larry Young. Delegate Young is also president of the Center for Urban Environmental Studies (CUES). As a State legislator and the head of CUES, Delegate Young has worked ardently to bring attention to the energy needs of low-income citizens. He is among those energy experts who continue to be dedicated to moving our Nation

toward energy independence. Delegate Young's speech entitled, "The Energy War and the Poor—One Year Later," was given on September 11, 1980, before the CUES National Teach-In II. The text follows:

#### THE ENERGY WAR AND THE POOR—ONE YEAR LATER

Good afternoon. I want you to know that it is a pleasure for me to speak to you today. The topic—"the impact of the energy crisis on minorities"—is near and dear to my heart. I have spent the better part of the last two years traveling throughout the Nation attempting to create a positive energy awareness within the minority, low-income community. We have been successful in some areas and unsuccessful in others. To illustrate a success, my colleague from Virginia, Delegate Bobby Scott, has embarked on a program in Newport News, Virginia to establish a Peninsula Energy Center that would serve as an information clearinghouse for minorities and energy. This is a good first step toward insuring positive, constructive interaction with energy policy-makers in Virginia. However, note that I said first step. Much more needs to be done to insure an equity principle in energy policy and I will talk about that later.

The condition of minorities and the low-income in relationship to the country's energy dilemma, is one of complete dependency. As our Nation is dependent on foreign oil, which will cost the U.S. \$90 billion in 1980, minorities and the poor are dependent on government and energy companies for energy assistance, adequate energy supplies to their communities, and equitable credit arrangements.

Not surprisingly, the same groups that are dependent on help have little or no voice in energy policy decisions. Again and again we see that minorities and the low-income are the first and worst casualties in the "energy war." By the way, first and worst is a close relative of last hired, first fired.

These communities are being punished. They are the first to:

- Feel the pinch of rising prices
- Feel the impact of supply shortages
- Experience economic dislocation

With prices, we all know the story. In 1977, the average cost of home heating oil was \$46 per gallon. The most recent figure available from the Labor Department was \$1.02 for July of 1980. That means in three years the price of heating oil has increased 122 percent. How many individuals do you know whose income has kept up with this increase?

Next, let's look at the price increases of electricity and natural gas:

U.S. average price in July, 1980 for 500 KWH of electricity was \$31.51, up \$.58 from June.

U.S. average price in July, 1980 for 40 therms of natural gas was \$17.18, up \$.19 from June.

With supply, in many low-income areas, small businesses distribute home heating fuel to minority and low-income communities. As these businesses have trouble in getting supplies, the communities they serve also have trouble. Supply rationing occurs which forces individuals to stretch a tank of oil farther than expected. This often means doing without adequate warmth or turning the stove on to heat the house. Also, remember the gas shortage of last year. I know for a fact that minority and inner-city neighborhoods virtually stopped.

Economic dislocations occur by the scenario created by increasing prices and short supplies. The natural gas shortage of 1977



caused severe cutbacks in employment. When jobs were lost, who do you think suffered? And it is not just the poor who suffer individually. The institutions that serve them are suffering, too. Day care, senior citizen, municipal, educational and health institutions that the poor depend on for survival are being crippled by the high cost of energy. The result is that the institutions available for aiding minorities and the poor are suffering as much as the individuals needing the help.

When we look at the issues of price, supply and economic dislocation together, the thought is troubling. What we see are families that are paying as much as 40 to 50 percent of their income for energy compared to 10 percent for middle and upper income households. We see families that are told to conserve their way out of their energy problems when at the same time these same families consume less energy per capita than other households. Finally, we see families that do not receive enough energy assistance subsidy because a Federal aid program uses a new eligibility criteria.

In the words of Dick Saul of the Community Services Administration, "Nobody has really come to grips with the problem." Minorities and the low-income need help and they need it now. They are willing to help themselves and they do. But we still must insure that energy policy has a social policy intertwined with it. DOE's Office of Minority Economic Impact is now doing it with Federal energy policy. Baltimore Gas and Electric has exhibited a social consciousness by contributing \$200,000 to a special group in Baltimore.

To help the poor pay fuel bills. These are positive examples but a national effort is needed to insure that the poor are not caught in the middle of energy policy tradeoffs.

Let's take a look at some energy policy decisions made during the last year. There have been quite a few; most have attempted to make us free from the excessive use of Mideast oil. The thrust of these decisions have been supply and conservation oriented. And as I illustrated earlier, these energy decisions can be double-bladed sword for the poor. While they help the nation in a broad perspective, they hurt the poor in individual cases.

Decontrol of oil prices last year was initiated to blunt energy demand and to give producers the profit to search for domestic oil. On the surface, producers have made increased profits, some as much as 100 to 200 percent higher in one year, and demand has been cut. Gasoline sales are off 20 to 25 percent. But has the increased profit gone to develop new oil domestically? No. Oil companies have recognized that oil is a fossil fuel, therefore, finite. The oil companies have used their profits to buy into the energy industries of the future—solar, coal and nuclear.

For example, 7 of the fifteen largest coal companies are owned by oil companies. 13 oil companies control almost 50 percent of the uranium reserves. Oil companies are diversifying by buying into solar. Mobil owns an 80 percent interest in Tyco which is a solar company that has developed a new technology that could revolutionize the industry. The basic rationale for de-control—to spur domestic oil production—just hasn't happened. Prices have shot up for consumers and that's the bottom line. Domestic production has increased only about 1 percent in the last year.

The Windfall Profits Tax, recently enacted by Congress and signed into law, was originally proposed as a vehicle to establish an Energy Security Fund to pay for mass transit aid, low income energy assistance

and synthetic fuels development. What came out of Congress was a general revenue measure. Of the \$227 billion to be generated by the tax—15 percent of the funds are earmarked for synthetic fuels and mass transit; 25 percent of the funds are earmarked for low-income assistance; and 60 percent, the largest chunk, is earmarked for personal and corporate tax cuts.

How many minorities and low-income people do you know who will benefit from personal and business tax cuts? With low-income assistance, Congress had the opportunity this year to provide real relief to the poor by authorizing a multi-year program funded at an acceptable level. Instead of doing this, Congress appropriated only \$1.8 for the low-income assistance program while increasing eligibility over last year. This was after \$3.15 billion was authorized. You know what happens—the poor must fight among themselves for the crumbs.

Another measure we need to take a close look at from the equity standpoint is the gasoline rationing plan submitted on June 12, 1980. The plan, to be instituted during oil shortages of at least 20 percent, would make gasoline available with only ration coupons. Checks for coupons would be mailed to registered vehicle owners. Isn't it interesting that 47 percent of the poor don't own vehicles? That only 37 percent have one car and 15 percent have two cars or more? Aging automobiles that get terrible gas mileage further aggravate the problem for the low income.

Energy conservation, while a quite appropriate path to follow for the nation, really doesn't offer much hope to the poor, either. The weatherization program, while a tremendous concept in that it creates jobs and helps save energy, really hasn't made a dent in the 8 million low income homes that lack insulation. For purely economic reasons, the low-income undertook energy conservation a long time ago. Figures show the poor use 50 percent less electricity and 24 percent less natural gas than higher income customers. What has their "conservation incentive" gotten them? It has forced them to pay higher unit costs because of inverted pricing structures. Also, because of older appliances, homes and cars, the energy used by the poor does not go that far.

Energy conservation efforts need to consider the unique circumstances of the poor. Tax credits for insulation means nothing to an individual who rents. Individuals living in master metered buildings have no control over the temperature of their homes. A special effort needs to be made to involve these citizens in our national conservation effort.

As we can see, both supply and conservation strategies can have severe consequences on the low-income. Therefore, the core of our energy problem is to find an acceptable way of coordinating supply, demand and cost. Our nation has decided that it is good for America to become independent of foreign oil producers. And yet, energy as a separate category of life's necessities is relatively new and not yet fully accepted by our nation. We have struggled with the nation's energy need but have forgotten the energy needs of minorities and the poor.

Congress has yet to put in place a long term assistance effort with a multi-year authorization. This troubles me when Congress has invested \$20 billion into synfuels and is considering legislation to give utilities \$10 billion to convert to coal. I would urge Congress to establish a permanent energy stamp program.

Energy stamps, through a public subsidy, would maintain the integrity of poor families to manage their own resources and make their own economic decisions. Existing income guidelines for food stamps could

apply to fuel stamps. The stamps would be for fuel only and could only be redeemed by fuel vendors. Conservation would be stressed because the low income would have to pay a portion of the cost of the stamps.

An energy stamp program would be advantageous because—

(A) It can benefit, rather than repeat, the mistakes of food stamp administration.

(B) Only income criteria not a new data base on energy consumption and expenditures is needed, simplifying administration.

(C) It will retain an element of low income families' integrity by enabling them to decide upon their own energy purchases.

(D) It maintains an incentive for energy conservation.

(E) It is acceptable to industry.

Next we need to pursue vigorous implementation of the Public Utilities Regulatory Policy Act of 1978. PURPA offers unique incentives to states and utilities to conserve energy through revisions in the rate making process. Some utilities have already seen merit in conservation. Companies such as the Potomac Electric Power Company and New England Power have been able to project savings of \$2 to 3 billion which otherwise would have been paid by consumers. This should be applauded.

We need to make sure that our state utility commissions are moving ahead in considering the rate standards outlined by PURPA. The standards, if implemented, could have a dramatic impact on the cost of electricity and service interruptions. And yet, the progress being made nationwide is slow at best. As of 6/30/79: 19 of 52 state regulatory authorities had not yet begun to consider the standards; 65 percent of the covered electric utilities had not begun consideration of the cost of service standard, the most crucial for meeting the intent of PURPA; Concerning regulatory standards, 14 states and 48 of 69 non-regulated utilities had not yet begun consideration.

If we have to prod our states and utilities to move ahead with PURPA then so be it. This is an important area to stay involved in.

We need to work for passage of the Energy Management Partnership Act. EMPA would consolidate all state conservation grant programs under one administrative umbrella. The legislation requires that States consider the needs of the poor in developing and modifying state energy plans. This will insure that the existing Energy Extension Service, Residential Conservation Service and State Energy Conservation Plans reach all segments of the community. As I said before, many energy conservation programs are aimed to the middle and upper classes only. This needs to be turned around.

We need to beef up the institutional mechanisms within the Department of Energy to insure input from minorities and the low-income in policy deliberations. This includes the Office of Minority Economic Impact and the Office of Consumer Affairs. They do a tremendous job but need more resources to continue with their mandates.

Finally, we need to focus attention to the National Energy Plan III. NEP III is scheduled to be unveiled in April, 1981. This Plan will set our nation's energy future for the next two years.

How many of you know that federal law requires broad citizen participation. It does. We need to take advantage of this unique opportunity to influence government energy policy. CUES is preparing an extensive participation plan and we ask you to join with us. Let's learn from the lessons of NEP I and II when citizen participation was nil and the policy deliberation process was lim-

ited to only bureaucrats and company people.

To close my remarks, instead of looking for someone to blame, let's work for solutions. We must turn our energies to the problems I discussed and focus our attention on some of the solutions I outlined.

We at CUES are working with you to answer the questions and find the solutions. We are available to help you as you face the energy issues of your communities and constituencies. For information or technical assistance use the toll free number 1-800-424-9591. We can't do it alone, but we can do it together.●

H.R. 6959

### HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the other day, the House passed the bill, H.R. 6959, providing for assistance to the salmon and steelhead fishing industry in the Pacific Northwest. While I am pleased that the Members from the affected area have been able to work together so effectively to produce a bill that they feel resolves their problem, I would like to again bring to the attention of the House the very serious problems we are facing in my State of Michigan due to Indian fishing.

Earlier this summer, hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife on the situation in Michigan. I am appreciative of the efforts and concern of the Members that took part in that hearing, particularly the distinguished chairman, Mr. BREAU. At this time, however, we are no closer to resolving this issue than we were then. Unregulated fishing by members of some Indian tribes continues to threaten the survivability of valuable fish species in the Great Lakes. Tensions are still high. Litigation drags on. It is a problem that needs attention now.

During committee markup of H.R. 6959, I offered amendments which would have included Michigan within the scope of the legislation. At the request of the members of the committee representing the Pacific Northwest, I withdrew the amendments rather than raise additional issues that could have caused problems for them in their efforts to pass this bill. I would only ask for their help next year in developing a solution to the problem we have in Michigan.

It is my understanding that my distinguished colleague, Mr. DINGELL, has received assurances that the Members that have developed this legislation will work closely with the Michigan delegation to resolve our problems in the 97th Congress. I am also aware of the continued interest and cooperation of Chairman BREAU and my ranking minority member on the committee, Mr. McCLOSKEY. I appreciate their past efforts and look forward to working with them again. Together, I am confident that we can make great

steps toward a reasonable solution to this issue.●

### TO HAVE OR HAVE NOT

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the August 1980 issue of Law Enforcement Communications carried an excellent article written by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, PETER RODINO. I have been privileged to sit on the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey, since he was elected to the chairmanship in 1973.

His article makes clear the need for more effective gun control laws, and demonstrates the support of the American public for strong gun laws. This insightful essay is an excellent example of why we on the Judiciary Committee so greatly respect and admire our chairman.

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

#### TO HAVE OR HAVE NOT

(By Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR.)

By this time tomorrow, 26 Americans will be murdered by handgun fire. By the next day, 26 more.

No one knows the magnitude of the problem better than the law enforcement officers who must risk their lives each day to protect innocent citizens. Last year, 77 local, county, state and federal law enforcement officers were killed by handguns. Overall, the murder rate of police officers was up 13 percent from 1978—and, in 1978, 72 percent of those officers killed were slain with handguns.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives is responsible for gun control legislation. As Chairman of that committee, I have long advocated stronger, more effective laws at the national, state and local levels, to reduce the handgun slaughter in our country. Information comes to my attention daily, indicating that violent crime, murder and aggravated assault are increasing—and, that the percentage of these crimes committed with handguns remains very high.

The scope of the problem of handgun violence—and its toll in human lives—is well documented. Here are a few of the details:

More Americans were murdered with handguns here at home during the years of the Vietnam War than American soldiers killed in combat in Vietnam . . . more than 50,000 handgun deaths.

Fifty percent of the murders reported throughout the nation in 1978 were committed with handguns.

Violent crime increased by ten percent during the first nine months of 1979, and handgun use has not slackened. In New York City, for instance, 4,000 persons were arrested for illegally carrying guns last year.

Handguns are used two and one-half times more than any other weapon to commit murders. Almost 10,000 Americans are murdered annually with handguns, according to FBI reports.

Sixty percent of murders involve family members or acquaintances rather than strangers. Statistics show that a handgun in

the home is more likely to injure or kill someone in the family through an accident or act of passion, or be used against the resident, than to deter an intruder.

In 1977, alone, there were an estimated 300,000 crimes involving handguns.

According to a study conducted in 1974 by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a child born in Atlanta would have a 1 in 25 chance of being murdered during his or her lifetime. In my home city of Newark, this ratio is 1 in 33; in New York City, 1 in 60. The situation had deteriorated in many cities since then.

#### THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE

The easy availability of handguns is a major cause of the widespread violence and bloodshed in our nation—and, the American public appears to have realized this for years. In fact, since the 1930's, public opinion polls have shown that the majority of Americans favor handgun control.

For example, 12 surveys since 1959 have asked the question, "Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?" In these polls, the percentage of the public favoring such a law has never dropped below 68 percent, and has climbed as high as 78 percent.

A 1978 poll released by Cambridge Reports, Inc. revealed a high level of public support for specific controls on handguns. It showed that:

88 percent of Americans nationwide favor a waiting period before a handgun can be purchased, to allow for a criminal record check;

81 percent favor strengthening the rules for becoming a commercial handgun dealer;

82 percent of the general public and 71 percent of all handgun owners want to require prospective handgun purchasers to obtain a permit or a license to purchase a handgun;

84 percent of the general public and 74 percent of all handgun dealers advocate the mandatory registration of all handguns at the time of purchase or transfer; and

70 percent of the American public favors banning of the future manufacture, and sale of small, cheap, low-quality handguns.

In February, 1980, George Gallup released a new poll which stated that 59 percent of all Americans want stricter laws covering the sale of handguns.

Despite this broad approval by the American public, and considerable public support for more effective handgun control, current federal regulations too often frustrate efforts to quickly and accurately trace firearms associated with crimes. Until 1968, the two basic federal statutes regulating the manufacture and distribution of firearms were the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. Both were designed primarily to curb the activities of the underworld gangs of the 1920's and 1930's. It was not until 1968—following the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Senator Robert Kennedy—that Congress enacted legislation with clear gun control provisions.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 requires all persons dealing in firearms or ammunition to be federally licensed. It prohibits the interstate sale of handguns generally and sets forth categories of persons to whom firearms may not be sold (such as minors and persons with criminal records). The current law also sets special penalties for the use of a firearm in the perpetration of a federal felony.

Despite these measures, the 1968 act has not achieved its goal: limitation of easy access to handguns for use in criminal activity. The ban on importing "easily conceal-



able handguns" has been effectively undermined by the importation of handgun parts, which are then assembled domestically.

The rising violent crime statistics mentioned earlier clearly point toward the need for stronger controls on the handgun industry, to combat illegal handgun traffic.

#### THE LOYAL OPPOSITION

Those groups opposed to placing controls on the handgun industry argue a simple slogan: "Guns don't kill people—people kill people." In a more sophisticated form, this argument relies upon statistics from cities and states which have relatively strict gun control laws. These statistics seem to indicate that, in certain isolated areas, gun-related deaths are not reduced by strict controls. However, the real meaning of these figures lies in what they say about the widespread trafficking in handguns and the need for broader restrictions.

The federal government's General Accounting Office (GAO) prepared a study for the Judiciary Committee two years ago, which examined handgun-related crimes in various areas of the country, to determine the effects of local gun control laws. The study revealed that, in jurisdictions with strict gun control laws, a substantially higher percentage of the weapons seized in crimes had been purchased in other jurisdictions—jurisdictions with less restrictive laws. Furthermore, in those cities—such as Boston and New York—where neighboring states have relatively stringent gun laws, the distance from which out-of-state weapons traveled tended to increase, according to the study.

These figures document what was already obvious to many of us involved in criminal justice—that the effect and effectiveness of gun control laws in a given city or state cannot be evaluated in a vacuum, without regard to the availability of guns from other areas.

The GAO study showed convincingly that the ease with which handguns are transported from one state to another requires far more uniformity of gun control standards throughout the United States.

#### NEW ACTION

A bill which Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) has introduced in the Senate (S. 1936) and I have introduced in the House (H.R. 5823) demonstrates how the uniformity can be achieved, while preserving a primary role for state and local officials in the enforcement of the law.

The bill seeks to stop the proliferation of easily concealable handguns through a combined effort by handgun importers, manufacturers, dealers and owners to become more accountable for the distribution and use of these guns.

Police Chief Roy McLaren of Arlington County, Virginia told a House Judiciary Subcommittee in 1978, "If a case of botulism, as a result of a spoiled can of soup, is reported in Oregon, all soup canned in the same lot, wherever distributed in the nation, can quickly be identified on the grocers' shelves. But currently, a very deadly item in commerce—the gun—cannot be effectively traced in many instances, because the federal government does not demand that firearm manufacturers provide unique serialization and other methods, to give us foolproof tracing and the same minimum safeguards as it does on the companies which produce soap."

The International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Police Executive Research Forum both endorsed proposed federal regulations in 1978, to require better record-keeping by handgun manufacturers, importers and dealers. Unfortunately, these regulations were never put into effect, but the

concept has been included in the legislation I am offering.

The bill, which has been referred to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, embodies the following provisions:

It bans the manufacturing, importing, assembling or selling of so-called "Saturday Night Specials" and other "easily concealable handguns," as determined by a special Handgun Criteria Commission. This would close the loophole in the 1968 Gun Control Act which banned handgun imports, but not the domestic assembly of foreign handgun parts.

In an effort designed to help law enforcement officials more effectively trace stolen handguns, licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers would be required to keep records of their handguns for ten years from the date originally shipped or transferred.

A 21-day waiting period for purchase of a handgun would be standard procedure. This would allow dealers time to verify that the buyer is over 21 years old and does not have a criminal record, a history of drug addiction or mental illness. The waiting period could be waived, if the purchaser had previously complied with a state procedure—such as license-to-carry laws, which are encouraged by the bill.

Persons who fail to report the theft or disappearance of a handgun would be subject to civil penalties on the first offense and possible criminal penalties on the second offense. More severe penalties would be imposed on those who failed to report theft, when that handgun subsequently was used in a felony.

If a person illegally sold a handgun to someone who used it to commit a violent crime, the seller would be civilly liable to the victim of that crime.

Federal support would be provided to state programs which compensate victims of crimes committed with handguns.

Pawnbrokers would be prohibited from selling handguns.

A handgun dealer would not be allowed to sell more than three handguns to a person in a single year without special approval by the Attorney General (for handgun collectors and other legitimate users).

The license fee for handgun dealers would increase from \$10 to \$500, and manufacturers' and importers' license fees, from \$50 to \$5,000.

The bill does not interfere with the right of American citizens to bear arms. Instead, it seeks to protect the right of all Americans to live in a peaceful society.

As violent crime continues to rise across America, I believe that Americans want Congress to take action to stop the proliferation of easily concealable handguns, which have no sporting purposes and are widely used by criminals.

While Congress, in the past, had been reluctant to approve handgun legislation, I am nonetheless hopeful that we are moving closer to a point at which effective gun control legislation can become a reality. I am encouraged that a record 50 members of the House have cosponsored my bill.●

#### INCENTIVES: THE HUMAN ELEMENT

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, at every level of our society the Federal Government is the enemy of initiative.

Much has been said and written about the need to reindustrialize America. However, in all this work we continue to ignore the human element. People working to make a better America need incentives also if our future is to be prosperous.

Unfortunately, the Government continues to ignore the human element. All the proposed plans and programs that ignore this factor will not enhance prosperity. I include this letter in the RECORD as an example of the despair that afflicts our people. We must learn to answer the question Patricia Holloway asks, and we must do it quickly and persuasively if we hold any hope for a brighter future.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GINGRICH: I realize there is nothing to be done about this situation, but I will feel better writing about it.

A neighbor divorced her husband. She has two boys. One is seven and one is six. The seven-year old is handicapped and receives a monthly check for \$194.00. The mother is on welfare, medicare, food stamps.

After receiving all this her children receive free lunches in school. Why she cannot fix their lunches with her already free food I cannot understand. She informed me that since their lunches are free everyday she will send them to school with an extra quarter for ice cream. So far, everyday, her children have bought ice cream.

My husband works. We pay our rent. We buy our food. We take care of our own medical and dental expenses. None of this is free to us. We also pay a large sum in our income to state, federal, and social security taxes. Our son's lunches cost us 50 cents every day. We don't have enough left out of our income to afford him an ice cream a day.

Today he asked me why Michael can have one everyday and he cannot. What shall I say? Because Michael's parents don't work and his do? Would it not give Michael more incentive to work instead of my son the idea it's better not to if Stan received the ice cream instead of Michael?

Please, help me to understand the system, so I can explain to a six-year-old boy who doesn't receive ice cream every day why his poor friend does.

Thank you,

PATRICIA HOLLOWAY.●

#### HAPPY 80TH TO REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to share with my colleagues in the House an article by Wendell Coltin of the Boston Herald American honoring Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER on the occasion of his 80th birthday.

Representative PEPPER, who celebrated his birthday on September 8, was justly recognized in the Herald American article for his role as champion of the Nation's elderly.

CLAUDE PEPPER is the oldest member of the House and I am the youngest. We share a deep concern for the well-

being of America's elderly citizens. I have had the good fortune to join with him in sponsoring the medigap insurance bill, which provides protection for the elderly from worthless insurance policies as well as a bill related to prevention of abuse to the elderly.

In continuing tribute to my distinguished colleague I am proud to submit this article and insert it in the RECORD.

HAPPY 80TH TO REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER

(By Wendell Coltin)

This Labor Day week, if you have a birthday card on hand—or would like to send a brief note of birthday greetings to someone who has labored for the elderly, you can address it to Rep. Claude Pepper, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Pepper, chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, and, appropriately, the oldest member of the House, will be 80 next Monday, Sept. 8. He has been a true friend of the elderly; loyal to their cause.

Under his leadership, the Committee on Aging has concerned itself with many problems of the elderly. Pepper has initiated numerous public hearings related to those problems, to unearth evidence that called for changes, improvements in certain public programs, and dignified treatment of elders. Hearings that he and fellow committeeman Rev. Robert F. Drinan held in Brookline and Waltham produced overwhelming testimony against mandatory retirement of workers because of age.

Pepper achieved fame for his crusade in behalf of the elderly. He played a major role in the enactment of legislation that led to abolition of mandatory retirement in the Federal Government and raising of the mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70 in the private sector. It is his aim—as it has been Drinan's too—that mandatory retirement be eliminated entirely.

Pepper's admirers point to his fighting leadership in getting a program of meals on wheels for persons too incapacitated to leave their homes; a \$32 million program to combat crime in the elderly's public housing projects; and discounts for elderly riders on Amtrak trains.

The Brookline and Waltham hearings demonstrated the importance of a state having membership on a congressional committee. Those hearings were held in Massachusetts because of Drinan's membership on the committee and a mutual respect that he and Pepper have publicly proclaimed for each other. When Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and former Sen. Edward W. Brooke were on the Senate Committee on Aging, the then chairman, Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, came to Boston to conduct a hearing in Gardner Auditorium, which was largely attended.

Val Halamandaris, an attorney on the staff of the House Committee on Aging, formerly on the Church-chaired Senate Committee on Aging, told me a few days ago, when I asked for a comment from him on Pepper:

"He is easily the most articulate and most able and most genteel member in the Congress."

"He has the greatest sensitivity, as far as understanding and appreciation of the problems of older Americans."

He recalled a meeting conducted by the leadership of the American Association of Retired Persons. He said, "Every major political figure came to address it. Pepper made the greatest impression. He has the ability to move a crowd. He loves people. He turns them on. Frank Church, a great

orator, spoke; Kennedy, too. Pepper got the longest reception and a prolonged standing ovation."

Halamandaris revealed that the committee is soon to come out with a report on 15 years of Medicare. Asked what it would say, he disclosed, "It will state there is a need to expand the program, that Medicare is on the verge of becoming a broken promise; that fewer and fewer doctors are taking assignment (on Medicare claims) and it will urge more doctors to take assignment."●

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND CAPTIVE NATIONS

### HON. RAPHAEL MUSTO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. MUSTO. Mr. Speaker, during one week in July of each year since 1959, the U.S. Congress, the Nation, and some of our allies dwell on the plight of the nations being held captive under Communist rule. Proclamations and public declarations are issued expressing determination to unswervingly uphold the principles of basic human rights, personal liberty, self-determination and national independence—the fundamental theme of Public Law 86-90. The participation in and responses to this concentration on captive nations have always been overwhelming; and in reviewing various CONGRESSIONAL RECORD inserts and "The Bicentennial Salute to the Captive Nations," it has become incumbent upon me to address this issue.

It is clear from much of what has been said about the captive nations that one must be able to appreciate the basic relationship of the captive nations to the strategic, moral, and other interests of our Nation. In other words:

In the captive nations orientation, as it has applied to our national interests and security, human rights has consistently been its central theme—on all levels of human rights, the personal, the civil, and the national.

No area in the world can be compared with the totalitarian, Communist area in relation to the gravest deprivation of human rights; and this area of captive nations has no boundaries. It reaches from the Danube to the Pacific and into the Caribbean. Thirty-one nations of freedom-loving peoples have been subjugated to Russian communistic imperialism. It is alarming to note that during the 1970's, three nations were brought under the yoke of communism's enslavement; and, too quickly in the 1980's one more Communist, totalitarian domination—Afghanistan. Sadly noted here is that not only has there been a lack of focus by the West on this latest Soviet Russian savagery, but also no help was given the Afghan nationalists in their struggle for freedom.

Is it possible that our leaders and opinionmakers can successfully per-

ceive events and developments behind the ever-existing iron, bamboo, and sugar curtains, and now an oil curtain, as well? The Kremlin's puppet, Castro, has been underscoring an island chain reaction in the Caribbean, having already completed the magnetization of Grenada and Jamaica. As an encore, is it possible he will produce Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala and raise the banana curtain? One must wonder on what new stage this old story will be repeated.

Make no mistake, Moscow will continue its underhanded operations to spread the communistic fungus by the same successful tactics of divide and conquer, subversion, terrorism, and cultivated disorder precipitating the coup. This historical experience is clearly evident from the captive nations list: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkmenistan, North Vietnam, Cuba, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Laos, and others.

The President has made a firm and solid commitment to human rights as a cornerstone of our foreign policy—something no other President had done. If we can have a clear understanding of the relationship of the captive nations and human rights, and if we can maintain a strong defense and be ever so vigilant, we need have no fear as the Russian Bear groans. The Soviet Union, which is made up of almost half of the captive nations under Communist domination in this world and is directed by its totalitarian clique in the Kremlin, is one of the last remaining empires of this century and is really one of the most insecure states in this world.

Today, tomorrow, every day thereafter, the role of all American people is to give evidence that we are relentless in our opposition to oppression, that we are steadfast in our pursuit of peace, freedom, and security for all peoples, that we are constant in our demand for and advancement of human rights globally, and that we have not forgotten the captive nations, which is our best hope for the future.●

## WOMEN VETERANS

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article by June Willenz, of the American Veterans Committee, makes a lot of sense to me. I hope my colleagues will read it. It appeared in the Stars and Stripes of September 18, 1980.



### WOMEN VETERANS: A FORGOTTEN POPULATION?

Women Veterans. Almost 700,000 of them. So what! They're veterans aren't they? They are eligible for veterans programs—home loans, veterans preference, GI Bill, VA hospital care, and more. But there's something different. In the past, some women veterans were denied benefits for decades—i.e., the WASPS, the Signal Corps women. There was also a time when the dependents of a woman veteran were not treated the same as those of a male veteran.

Some of the inequities have been corrected. Others continue to exist. Women veterans as a population are not recognized as a separate group by government agencies collecting data on women. There is almost no historical data on women veterans. No substantive social science research has been done on women veterans. The 1980 Census is the first time that women have been queried as to their veteran status. Astonishingly, the VA, charged with administering veterans benefits, has little, if any, data on women veterans. To this day, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics compared unemployment figures for veterans against male non-veterans, ignoring women veterans entirely. A recent study of the National Academy of Sciences on the VA Hospital system only considered male veterans in their study "because the female veterans amount to less than 2 percent of the current total." But that is changing. The Department of Defense is projecting a participation rate of 12 percent by 1984 and there is a strong possibility that this figure may be low.

The American Veterans Committee (AVC) has been struck by the lack of information and concomitantly, lack of interest about women veterans. Last year, AVC began an exploratory investigation of women veterans in our society, under the auspices of the Ford Foundation. Not only did we find out that government agencies do not systematically collect data on women veterans but they have operated on the assumption that what is good for male veterans is good for female veterans. Since veterans benefits and programs have been designed for male veterans, this is an assumption that may or may not be correct.

There has never been an analysis of what veterans benefits programs women veterans have used, how many used them, and whether they were helpful to them. Furthermore, there has never been an inquiry of women veterans as to what veterans benefits other than the existing one would be of value to them. AVC is planning to conduct an indepth study of these important questions.

Women veterans may have needs that are not being met under the present system. AVC's initial review began to uncover these problem areas. Often, women veterans have assumed traditional roles as wives and mothers after leaving military service. These roles have meant that women veterans delayed use of many benefits programs until their children were grown, or sometimes under the adverse circumstances of either widowhood or divorce. These events often take place long after eligibility has run out; women find themselves high and dry when they need their veterans benefits most.

While it is true that often male veterans delay their use of benefits for equally good reasons, the traditional roles of women almost automatically become a barrier to using the veterans benefits rightfully theirs, because of the limited time frame.

Another instance where women veterans are shortchanged is in the VA hospital

system which does not provide any of the specific services that women need, such as gynecological and obstetrical. Many women veterans are not even aware that they can obtain contract services through the VA. There are reports of insensitivity towards women veterans seeking medical or hospital care and little that we know of has been done to make the VA medical system responsive to the needs of women veterans.

AVC has called upon the VA to establish a Veterans Administration Advisory Panel of Women, structured along the Department of Defense's Defense Advisory Committee On Women In The Services (DACOWITS). This independent citizens' advisory body would provide a useful channel of advice, council, and suggestions to the Administrator on the problems of women beneficiaries of veterans programs. This would include the problems of survivors and dependents, as well as those women veterans themselves.

VA Administrator Max Cleland has turned down the AVC suggestion and stated that such a Panel "is not the best approach at this time." Administrator Cleland indicated that actions had been taken at the VA to expand the VA's capabilities in dealing with the concerns of women veterans.

AVC applauded the actions of the Administrator but pointed out that his actions would not preempt the desirability of setting up a VA Advisory Panel on Women. The AVC suggested Panel would be outside the institution of the VA itself and would therefore have more credibility in its recommendations. A parallel group to the DACOWITS would serve the VA well, AVC pointed out, and would also provide women veterans another channel of communication if VA avenues were closed or not responsive.

In its response to the Administrator's negative decision regarding the creation to this Panel, AVC asked Mr. Cleland to reconsider his decision. Women veterans have rendered unique service to this nation, and they are proud of it. But they have too often been treated like second-class veterans. AVC called upon the VA to take a courageous step forward and set up this Panel.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Women veterans may respond to Willenz comments directly to the American Veterans Committee, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 930, Washington, D.C. 20036, or to The Stars and Stripes.)

### THE ALEINER FAMILY

#### HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the case of Boris and Lisa Aleiner whose marriage spans 7,000 miles and the harsh reality of Soviet politics.

Lisa Aleiner resides in my district with her 10-month-old son, Sasha, who has yet to meet his father. Lisa and Boris met in March of 1976 when she and her family spent a week in Leningrad as part of a vacation tour. She returned with her sister the following summer for a 6-week visit and a romance took root. The next summer she returned to Leningrad to marry Boris on August 28, 1978. The following April she returned to her parents' home to await the birth of Sasha.

On March 12, 1979, Boris applied to leave the Soviet Union for the United States. He was refused on July 15 of that year. The reason given was "security" for a job he held 3 years previously. He waited the allotted time and reapplied. In May, again he was refused but no reason given this time. He must now wait 6 months before reapplying.

Boris Aleiner calls his wife every Sunday and sometimes Sasha makes baby sounds over the telephone. Lisa's mother has become an amateur photographer since the birth of her first grandchild and sends a stream of photographs to Leningrad charting Sasha's growth.

Lisa and Boris are now appealing to the Congress of the United States for assistance in contacting Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin about their case.

I will be sending a dear colleague letter requesting signatures for a letter to Anatoly Dobrynin about the Aleiner family. I hope you will join me on this letter and urge that this family be reunited.

### TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN ROBERT DUNCAN

#### HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, It is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to join my many colleagues here today as we salute one of the great members of this legislative body—Bob DUNCAN.

Bob and I have been friends now for many years. He is always affable, caring, hard working, and best of all, a dependable friend. I have lost count of the times Bob has gone that extra mile for my constituents in Guam. He knows of their problems and he cares about helping my people solve their problems.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, Bob has spent more than a few hours listening to residents of Guam and other U.S. territories. I can never remember a time when he was not attentive and direct in his questions and his support. That he should take so much of his valuable time for people who do not even live in his district let alone his State, is typical of Bob. He did not care where you came from; only that he wanted to do all he could to resolve a problem if he honestly could. There never was a time when I did not feel free to pick up the phone and tell Bob DUNCAN that I needed his support. And my only regret is that I seldom had the opportunity to return the favor so popular is he in this body.

I am going to miss Bob DUNCAN and so will the people of Guam. We need all of the friends we can get and Bob DUNCAN was one of the best we ever knew on Capitol Hill.

I have no doubt that the future, however, holds great things in store for a man who has been a two-time Congressman, a gold miner, sailor, corn salesman, and who knows what else. He is a man who is willing to take any challenge, and a man like this is never going to sit still for long. Good luck, Bob. You leave behind countless friends including myself. We will be watching and cheering your future exploits.●

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN  
ROBERT DUNCAN

HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1980

● Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this special order being brought in behalf of Congressman BOB DUNCAN. There are some of us who come on the scene and go and there is not much change but BOB DUNCAN is not one of those. The Congress and the United States will miss his able leadership and dedicated service.

I know of no one who has been more capable, more conscientious and who has followed through to meet the needs of the country rather than the politically expedient than BOB DUNCAN. Perhaps the reason he did not win the primary was because he stated it the way it was and that offended some.

BOB DUNCAN has always been concerned about those who have not and those who are imposed upon and those who are abused. He has been very athletic and is very inquisitive. He has a great sense of humor, sometimes a little rough, but nonetheless a great sense of humor; but he is not without artistic appreciation and does have a sense of the arts and of great music. He is a very deeply human individual once you get under his crust.

He has taken on some issues over the environment to make things more reasonable and responsible. He has done yeoman work on transportation appropriations as well as on interior in maintaining the viability of our natural resources and providing support for States which provide the timber for the houses and the construction industry of this country.

He has the foresight and vision to know what that means rather than the momentary expediency. We have too few who have that long-term vision as it relates to the natural resources of this country. Without it we will not long survive and we will use up our seed corn and one day be destitute. He is one who has had the vision to prepare for the future of those resources. He has been tenacious in his efforts to see that it happens and I have been delighted to support him in those efforts.

BOB DUNCAN is a very competent and capable attorney, a family man, and

one who is capable of doing a lot of his own repairs. He also has a bit of the old country sage as it relates to "medical practice."

The name DUNCAN needless to say is of Scottish origin—a fellow Congressman who, true to the tradition, has been very concerned about the public purse and not willing to squander a nickel.

BOB DUNCAN is an example of what I would consider the solid bedrock American who operates from a base of commonsense not high theoretical unrealness. With people like him in goodly numbers the country will be secure for generations yet to come.

Mr. Speaker I trust that the future will hold still many good things and there will be those who will yet call on his services for the benefit of his fellow men and this country. He has served well not only here but in the Armed Forces, in his community, and heeded the call of his party and the country many times and we hope that will continue for many, many years.

It has been a personal delight for me to have been able to associate with him and have him as a personal friend in the time that we have been in this great deliberative body of the greatest democracy on Earth.●

JOHN STEVENS—TESTIMONIAL

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to rise with me in honoring Mr. John Stevens, an outstanding and dedicated public servant who is retiring from his position as director of public works for the city of Santa Ana.

John first came to the city of Santa Ana from the city of Hermosa Beach, in 1970. From 1970 until 1976 he served as assistant director of public works, and in 1976 was named director of public works.

Under John's leadership and direction the city of Santa Ana has constructed a new city hall, initiated a sidewalk improvement program, installed new street lighting, widened streets, and laid the groundwork for a new Amtrak station and Broadway overpass.

In addition to his outstanding accomplishments as director of public works, John has dedicated himself to the advancement of his profession through his participation in groups like the American Society of Civil Engineers, the California Society of Professional Engineers, the City and County Engineer's Association, and the American Public Works Association.

When not involved in professional activities John has been a dedicated father of five, and grandfather of three. He has participated in numer-

ous civic and community activities, and is a member of the Board of Directors for Rotary International. As time has permitted he has traveled to many foreign countries, including: Egypt, Russia, Peru, and Micronesia.

I believe it fair to say that the lives of each and every resident of the city of Santa Ana have been made better because John Stevens has given so freely of his time and talents to our community. We are sorry to see John leave. We wish him the very best, and we shall always be grateful for the years of unselfish service he has given to our city.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to ask my colleagues to join with me in commending an outstanding public servant and a man who has served as an inspiration to us all—John we thank you.●

TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT  
DUNCAN

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1980

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, we are all going to miss BOB DUNCAN a great deal. He has been a vital presence in this body over the past several years.

BOB has been best known recently for his work on the Appropriations Committee, where he has chaired the Subcommittee on Transportation. But he has contributed tremendously in numerous other areas, and when he leaves this body, his accomplishments will remain behind.

I want to take this opportunity to wish BOB the best of luck in all of his future endeavors. He has been a good friend and colleague, and we are very sorry that he will no longer be with us, but we all hope that he will return frequently.●

PERSIAN GULF SECURITY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I addressed the House in regard to the war between Iran and Iraq, and in particular the sale of gas turbine engines for the Iraqi Navy. Today, I would like to reiterate my concerns in regard to these matters.

As my colleagues know, in another abrupt change of course, the Carter administration recently decided to hold up the shipment of General Electric gas turbines ordered by the Iraqi Navy. I would like to emphasize that the administration's decision to delay this shipment is reportedly a temporary one. In view of the gravity of the current situation in the Persian Gulf,



as well as Iraq's past record in relation to supporting international terrorism. I firmly believe that this turbine transaction should be permanently revoked. The sale of these engines can only exacerbate Persian Gulf tensions, and as a result, can only heighten the risks to our hostages and our oil supply.

It is regrettable that two of the eight engines have recently been sent and that two more were scheduled to be shipped in late September. Moreover, last week, conferees were scheduled to consider the foreign aid authorization including an amendment which would block the sale of the gas turbines. The conference meeting, however, was canceled and probably will not reconvene until after the election. As a result, there may be sufficient time for the remaining engines to be shipped to Italy where they are being installed on ships for Iraq.

In short, I believe that the United States should not be supplying equipment with a military use to Iraq, but instead pledging to peacefully resolve the tensions between Iraq and Iran. Moreover, we must not only continue to consult with our allies on this matter, but also to politically and diplomatically minimize Soviet opportunism in the gulf.

With the growing concern over the threat to Western oil resources which are especially posed by the Iran-Iraq war, it is important that the United States and its allies discuss contingency strategies on securing oil routes, including the Strait of Hormuz. The establishment of a sealane security system among allies and friends would greatly help in keeping the vital shipping lanes open to world trade. Equally important, we must continue to encourage Soviet neutrality in this matter. In this regard, I support current administration efforts, hoping that a major catastrophe can be averted by attempting to peacefully resolve the heated tensions in the Persian Gulf today. ●

#### PRAISING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Washington Post carried an excellent story about the recipients of distinguished Presidential rank awards, and the recipients of meritorious Presidential rank awards. While the coverage given to the 255 people named under this new recognition program was well deserved, and this type of good news about Federal employees should be widely shared, I think it is important to recognize that such exemplary service can be found all the way down the line in the Federal employee system.

One such example was recently brought to my attention concerning a

postman in my congressional district. Since the Postal Service has been a particularly prominent target of those who insist on denigrating the Federal Government, I take some pride in pointing out a side of the Postal Service that most of us have had personal experience with, the concerned and dedicated postman.

In a news article which follows these remarks, the story of how letter carrier Charles "Chuck" Franks saved the life of an elderly woman who lived alone is described. This type of action is not uncommon, but when it is reported, it deserves to be recognized. And the U.S. Postal Service deserves credit for its participation in the nationwide postal alert program, which will make such acts of public service even more common.

The article follows:

[Riverside Press-Enterprise, July 18, 1980]

THE POSTMAN RINGS TWICE AND GETS AN AWARD FOR SAVINGS WOMAN'S LIFE

(By Sandy Pavicic)

The mail may be a little late in Magnolia Center today. That's because the letter carrier, Charles "Chuck" Franks has a breakfast date with the mayor.

It is unusual for Franks to be late for work, but today he has a good excuse.

The 44-year-old letter carrier is going to be honored at City Hall for helping save the life of Ann Mulhern, an elderly woman who lived on Emerson Street.

One day in May, Mulhern fell and broke her hip in her living room and no one noticed.

According to her neighbor several doors down, Elizabeth Emerson, the children in the neighborhood were frequently the brunt of Mulhern's wrath. But aside from that, no one really bothered with her.

"She didn't like people," Emerson said, "She just wanted to be left alone."

Still, Franks was used to a greeting from Mulhern as he dropped off her mail each day.

Two days after she fell, Franks began wondering what had happened to her. He queried a few neighbors but they could not remember when they had last seen her standing at her living room window or hollering at the neighborhood children.

According to Emerson, no one really thought anything of it, because Mulhern was generally a private person.

The next day, May 24, Franks was certain something was wrong. After he finished his route, he went back to Mulhern's home with his wife, Geraldine. The two of them began pounding on the door.

"I was able to raise her," Franks said. "I could hear her voice and I found out she wasn't all right."

He borrowed a screwdriver from one of the neighbors and broke into the house. "She was lying on the floor by the couch," Franks said.

Franks said Mulhern had lain on her living room floor three days with a broken hip.

Mulhern is recovering from her accident at Magnolia Convalescent Hospital. "She won't see visitors," Franks said, "but she sees me." He said he stops in to check on her every time he gets a chance.

Franks has been on a foot route in Magnolia Center for the last 12 of his 20 years at the Riverside Post Office. He knows almost everyone along the 15-mile route. He hasn't missed a day of work since he was off for five months recovering from open heart surgery last year.

"I started here with patrons who had little kids," he said. "Now their kids are grown and have families of their own."

He paused yesterday as he handed Elizabeth Emerson her mail and said, "I'm getting an award tomorrow morning." Then Franks invited Emerson to Mayor Ab Brown's breakfast in his honor.

Emerson has sent a letter to Postmaster Jack O. Starnes to inform him of, "the humane action of our mailman called Chuck."

Franks credits Emerson's letter with his receipt of a \$250 Special Achievement Award from the U.S. Postal Service, the plaque he will receive from the mayor and a framed certificate of appreciation from the postal service.

Emerson said sending Starnes a letter, "was just something I had to do. I felt so guilty about what I didn't do."

"I don't know whether I wrote the letter out of appreciation or guilt. He wouldn't have had to get involved if we had done our job as a neighborhood. It makes us sick that we didn't do anything. From now on we will take care of our neighbors."

According to Starnes, the postal service in Riverside is just getting into full swing for participation in the national Postal Alert program for older persons.

Letter carriers will keep an eye on the elderly and infirm patrons on their route if the patron asks for the service. ●

#### TROUBLE IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

**HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on September 2, the Auto Task Force held its first public hearing in the city of Detroit. The purpose of this meeting was to assess the impact of the sharp drop in American auto sales on local communities. Among the witnesses who testified was Mayor Angelo Wedo of Brook Park, Ohio. I wish to share his testimony with my colleagues:

#### TESTIMONY OF MAYOR WEDO BEFORE THE AUTO TASK FORCE

Mr. Chairman, members of the United States Automobile Task Force, what is the overall effect of the unemployed auto workers?

Presently we have 300,000 unemployed auto workers in the United States. There is another 550,000 laid off in the auto-related industry and an additional 100,000 laid off by the closing of 900 auto dealers. This presents a very grave problem to our country. The decay to the economy of our nation by the above problem has reached a point of near insurmountable damage. The unemployment problem has had extreme effect to all governmental agencies, i.e. municipal governments, etc.

Example: Brook Park, Ohio, a community of approximately 30,000 residents with one major industry to carry the tax burden of our community has been extremely affected by the Auto Industry and Auto-Related industry layoffs.

In 1979 Brook Park, because of rising costs of government was forced to ask for a one-half percent increase in our municipal income tax. This tax was passed on November 5, 1979 and became effective November 6, 1979. For example, this increase was

quickly wiped out by the layoffs in the auto industry and particularly in the City of Brook Park, Ford Motor Company. Our municipal tax collection through August 31, 1980 (with the one-half percent increase) was the same for the exact period of time through 1979 before the increase of municipal income tax.

A municipality needs a minimum increase of income of 10 percent per annum to remain status quo. Unless the additional income is derived, a municipality has two choices, increase taxes or cut the work force in all areas. Cutting of the work force could be disastrous due to the fact that in time of decreased employment crime rises and the public suffers.

The City of Brook Park was forced to make major downward revisions in expenditures totaling 1.8 million dollars, which represents over 10 percent of its appropriations. These reductions were made both in operating and capital funds.

The City of Brook Park has been earnestly seeking other types of industry to locate here to help alleviate the revenue loss of auto and auto-related jobs.

What impact have the layoffs had?

A loss of 7015 jobs in Brook Park's major auto industry, plus an additional 1500 employees directly related to the auto industry.

For example let me summarize how the layoffs reflect on revenue losses to the City of Brook Park.

Estimated annual earnings for 8,500 employees.....	\$18,000
Number of employees.....	8,500
Dollar loss to economy.....	\$153,000,000
Gross payroll loss.....	\$153,000,000
Municipal tax rate.....	.015
Net tax loss Brook Park.....	\$2,295,000

I realize that there is an offset to this loss in sub-pay benefits. However, as the attached chart (Exhibit A attached) indicates, during the time a person is unemployed our municipality receives only 34 percent of the tax it would have received if the person were still employed. We must also realize that once the benefits are exhausted the municipality receives no tax.

Besides the effect on Brook Park and other municipalities, a big loser is the Federal Government.

[In billions of dollars per year]

Estimated Federal income tax loss	
Auto industry.....	1
Auto related.....	1.5
Auto dealership closing.....	.003

In addition, add the loss of corporate tax revenue which can be extremely high due to the 3 year carry back, 5 year carried forward section of the internal revenue code. (Dealing with corporate tax). The tremendous costs in increased welfare aid after unemployment benefits expires. Balance of Foreign Trade payments causing our country to fall further back and thus affecting the value of the American dollar.

What are the primary reasons for the depressed auto industry?

Flooding of the American markets with imports of Japanese-manufactured autos and trucks. Manufactured mostly on an overtime basis while our people are out of work.

Unrealistic demands of the United States Environmental Protection Agency on automotive emission standards that are further crippling our already devastated auto industry.

Evasion of payment of the 25 percent truck tariff by shipping trucks into this country with truck beds missing, using the guise of parts shipments to avoid payment of tariff.

Possible Remedies: Passage of Resolutions SJ-193 and HR-598 allowing the administration to negotiate with the Japanese Government to limit the number of imports allowed to enter our country. Also forcing the International Trade Commission to invoke the section of S-201 dealing with injury to the American Auto Industry. If the unemployment problem is not significant enough to enact S-201 concerning overall injury to the American economy, then I am completely baffled as to what it takes to invoke the section of S-201 by the International Trade Commission.

Reduce the standards imposed by the U.S.E.P.A. on the auto industry to something realistic that it can live with. (Incidentally, this could also be a deterrent to continued run-away inflation.) Force foreign

manufacturing firms to build their plants in the United States and provide jobs for Americans while still maintaining a strong tariff for parts manufactured abroad (3 percent tariff is ridiculous in light of other countries tariffs, as well as, quantity limitations). Why allow the United States to be a "Patsy" at the expense of the American people?

Impose or re-regulate the "Oil Industry" whose prices have reached as high as the world market retail prices and whose profits are completely unconscionable.

Rather than the windfall profit tax, let's reduce the price of oil products at the retail outlet giving Mr. and Mrs. John Doe the benefit of some dollar savings. In plain words, reduce the price of gasoline at the pumps.

In 1974, we had a severe shortage in auto fuel. American auto manufacturers began producing small cars. As soon as our fuel supplies increased the auto industry had to give rebates in order to sell their built up inventory of small cars.

In Conclusion: The Japanese now have approximately 32 percent of the auto market tied up. If and unless we do not negotiate some form of controls on Japanese imports, it is estimated by 1985, the Japanese Auto Industry will control 35-40 percent of the American auto market. It is needless to speak of the control on the auto parts market.

Passage of Resolutions SJ-193 and HR-598 will eliminate any questions the administration has on negotiating controls on imports. Thus helping to alleviate our unemployment problems in the auto industry.

The broad effect of reducing unemployment would cease the continued erosion of our economic condition, and aid in retarding inflation and, most of all, put people back to work.

Will eliminating the closing of manufacturing facilities that could be so vital to our national defense, restore the respectability of the men and women who pay the bulk of taxes to support this country?

Ladies and Gentlemen of Congress, how many more American Industries will we lose before we make laws to protect the interest of the American people? Let's use your legislative authority to put our men and women back to work.

Thank you.

EXHIBIT A.—FORD MOTOR CO.—UAW SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT PLAN

Hourly rate	Weekly straight pay	Tax deductions				Benefit after tax	Unemployment compensation and other compensation	Vacation holiday pay	Credit unit balance	Exemptions	Taxes			Union dues optional deduction	Benefit paid	Draft number
		Federal FICA	State	State unemployment compensation	City						Federal	State	City			
9.085	382.20	84.87	5.40		5.73	271.89	128.00		50.57	M DH M 000 0	12.92				115.67	0549786
											0	0.83	1.97			
	\$5.73															
	- 1.97															
	\$3.76/per person loss as long as benefits last. ●															

## THOUSANDS LINE UP FOR 75 JOBS AT SSA

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, each day we are faced with the harsh realities of rampant unemployment throughout our Nation. My own district, the Seventh District of Maryland, is plagued with a 15-percent

unemployment rate, with a 45-percent rate among the minority population.

The situation described in the article below is yet another painful reminder that the jobs are just not available. During the recent week of September 15, 1980, the Social Security Administration in Baltimore had to inform some 12,000 applicants that they had only 75 openings available for unskilled jobs. Undoubtedly, all 12,000 of these applicants were not unskilled laborers. However, the fact that these people have reached such a point of desperation reiterates the critical need for more employment opportunities.

Knowing of my colleagues' genuine concern for the current national unemployment dilemma, I am submitting a recent article from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Thousands line up for 75 jobs at SSA."

The article follows:

### THOUSANDS LINE UP FOR 75 JOBS AT SSA

(By Allegra Bennett)

Divested of all but hope, at least 12,000 job applicants lined up around three federal buildings here yesterday, seeking applications for unskilled jobs with the Social Security Administration—but there were only 75 openings available.



Word had spread mostly by mouth that applications would be available this week at the three buildings for jobs in three categories at the Social Security Administration that require no written examination and no experience. Some job-seekers had been drawn by Social Security literature announcing jobs were available but failing to specify the limited number of current openings.

The rush of applicants took federal administrators at the three offices by surprise yesterday.

The applicants were vying for positions paying from \$7,210 a year for clerks and clerk-typists to \$11,564.80 for warehouse workers.

"These applications will help relieve the turnover at these level jobs," according to John B. Trollinger, deputy press aide for the Social Security Administration. He added that the applications will remain on file for one year and additional jobs in those three categories could materialize in that time, but he would not speculate on how many.

Toni Winchester—who had been waiting in a line at Social Security's Metro West office on Greene street but had walked over to one at the federal courthouse that was shorter—did not care which job she might get as long as she got one of them.

"I have been looking [for work] for two years, since my daughter was old enough to go to school. Everyone turned me down because I don't have a job," the 28-year-old mother of two school-age children said.

Explaining what she saw as an irony, Ms. Winchester observed that during two years of job-hunting, employers had appeared more interested in applicants who are already employed and who were seeking better jobs than in those who were without jobs.

"Those with jobs seem to get the jobs," she concluded.

Standing next to her, Linda Cureton, 19, who had been job hunting since graduating from high school earlier this year, agreed. With no work experience to offer, however, Ms. Cureton had been learning first-hand the meaning of the recent increases in unemployment.

According to the Department of Labor, unemployment in the Baltimore metropolitan area—which includes the city and five adjacent counties—for the month of July was 8.1 percent. For the city alone, the figure was 9.9 percent.

"I applied at Social Security last April for a temporary position but was not called," said Ms. Cureton. "I'm still waiting. I'll take anything."

Nineteen-year-old Cameron Franklin thought he wouldn't have a problem finding work when he graduated from high school this year with a diploma in commercial art. What he found on the job market, however, was an oversupply of "people with more experience than high school."

"More experience means college," the Walbrook high graduate said. "I don't want to go to college. I would be in the same situation I was in high school. I would still need money."

The Social Security Administration did not advertise the available positions, according to Mr. Trollinger.

However, the word appeared to spread like wildfire, from church pastors alerted by job committees in their churches that the positions were becoming available and from friends and relatives employed at the Social Security complex.

The federal agency did place a job order with the state employment service, Mr. Trollinger said. He added that such jobs previously had been filled through applica-

tions to the federal Office of Personnel Management but that procedure was changed recently, as an efficiency move, to allow Social Security to fill those jobs directly.

As early as 6 a.m. yesterday, a crowd began building and spilling out into the intersection of Lombard street and Hopkins place and encircling the U.S. District Courthouse, where a few thousand applications were available at the Federal Job Information Center.

Several blocks away on Greene street and a few miles away in Woodlawn, there were similar scenes at the Social Security Administration offices there.

The doors at the federal courthouse were opened to the applicants at 7:45 a.m., but an hour and 45 minutes later, officials had run through the 2,200 applications on hand.

An additional supply of 2,500 applications was exhausted within two hours, and officials used a copying machine to make 700 impromptu forms while awaiting the arrival of 2,500 more applications.

The distribution centers combined to hand out more than 12,000 applications yesterday, according to Mr. Trollinger.

Those who are hired, he said, will be temporary employees who may become permanent at the end of three years.

Looking around her, Ms. Winchester assessed the crowd and thought about the stream of application forms she had completed at fast food restaurants and with other employers.

"It's not that they are not looking," she said. "You may get up Monday and look [for a job] but by Thursday [you] get so discouraged." ●

#### BILL GREEN DEPLORES HOUSE ACTION ON ABORTION

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, this year, the House has placed greater restrictions on the availability of Federal funds for abortions than last year. Greater and greater segments of the population have been touched by the current House restrictions. I would like to take this opportunity, as we move into the final phase of the appropriations process, to express my deep concern over the action taken by the Congress with respect to the abortion issue.

This year, again, we have, as a practical matter, usurped the right of many women to decide whether or not they should have an abortion—a right granted to all women by the Supreme Court in 1973. Language which restricts the availability of abortions has been included in, or offered as amendments to, many of the appropriations bills considered by the House this fall. The Labor-HEW appropriations bill passed on August 27 contained language stating that Medicaid may not fund abortions except in cases where the woman's life is endangered by the pregnancy. You will recall that last year's so-called compromise on the Medicaid funding language, finally reached in November, permitted abortions only in cases of rape, incest, and

life endangerment. I felt then, and I still feel now, that any of these criteria is too restrictive. The Congress has set a moral standard by telling women in which cases they can, and in which cases they cannot, have an abortion. I do not believe this is, or should be, the role of a legislature.

While last year's defense appropriations bill included a provision which permitted federally funded abortions in cases of rape, incest, and endangerment of life, this September the House passed a defense appropriations bill which allows abortion services for military personnel and their families only in cases of life endangerment. This, again, is more restrictive than last year's language. It forces a woman covered by the Defense Department's health plan to have the child, or to find some other means of having an abortion, which could be detrimental to her health. Undoubtedly any alternative creates an extraordinary expense for individuals who are living on the salaries provided by the Defense Department, which I believe are too low.

An amendment was offered to the Treasury/Postal Service appropriations bill which would prohibit the Federal Government from offering its employees any health plans which include abortion services; the amendment was passed by the House by the very large margin of 228-170. While this large majority was very distressing to me, I understand that the Senate Appropriations Committee, to which the bill was referred after House passage, struck the language pertaining to health plans for Federal employees. This Senate committee action is a very positive sign, and I hope this position will be maintained when the bill reaches the Senate floor.

Time and time again, we have considered the abortion issue. However, it seems that we continually neglect the most basic questions associated with this issue: Whether or not a woman has a right to determine her own destiny, whether or not the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid her in doing this, and whether we should choose to provide adequate health care for all women, or to force them, in some cases, to find some other means of providing for their needs. I can only restate my belief that Federal funds should be used to provide this service, the alternatives to this are dangerous and irresponsible on the part of the Government.

I recognize that many oppose abortions on religious or moral grounds. I know that those who oppose abortions hold these convictions deeply and for reasons of which I am well aware. Nevertheless, as Representatives of 220 million people, we cannot ignore the fact that there are many who do not share these views. I personally concluded that each individual should be afforded the opportunity to make this important decision on the basis of in-

dividual conviction, regardless of economic circumstance.

I understand that those who oppose abortions believe that a portion of their tax dollars is going to pay for something which they find morally objectionable. Nonetheless, this situation is not unique. Pacifists have also found defense appropriations to be contrary to their convictions.

I appeal to my colleagues today to consider the abortion issue carefully and to consider the effect of these and future amendments on our citizens. I continue to hope that prochoice Members will eventually prevail, as I feel it is imperative to provide adequate health care, which includes abortion services, to all women.●

#### SCIENCE AND THE PUBLIC

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● **Mr. BROWN** of California. **Mr. Speaker**, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, I have long been involved with the interface between science and society and the inevitable conflicts that are involved with this interaction. Isaac Asimov, a renowned science writer, scientist, and commentator on the history and development of science can offer unique insight into the responsibility of scientists to view their work within the context of society and on the impact to society of their work. Society's obligation to understand the scientific process—with the help of scientists—if it is to share and participate in the decisions of the scientific community, is a view I share strongly with Dr. Asimov. I commend to my colleagues the following article on this subject by Dr. Asimov appearing in the August 28, 1980, edition of the Los Angeles Times:

SCIENCE, PUBLIC MUST BE FRIENDS IF THE  
WORLD IS TO SURVIVE  
(By Isaac Asimov)

Until 1752, science had been a pursuit for gentlemen, a staid inspection of the universe out of intellectual curiosity, a motivation quite divorced from the practical things of life. Then came that eminently practical man, Benjamin Franklin.

He investigated electrical phenomena, as 50 other learned savants were doing, and it reminded him of phenomena in a thunderstorm, differing only in a matter of scale. In 1752, then, he flew a kite in a thunderstorm and use the heavens as a source of electricity for charging a down-to-earth Leyden jar. He then used that theoretical knowledge to design a lightning rod.

Franklin used science to defeat a natural calamity. Against the pointed metal rod (properly grounded), the dreaded lightning stroke fell back harmless. The public learned, for the first time, that science worked for it, not merely for the academics.

From that time on, science moved from strength to strength. As scientists learned more and more about the rules that governed the universe and everything in it, those rules were applied to the business of

humanity. At every step, science, in all its branches, became more intimately concerned with everyday life.

Now we see electronics, medicinals, solid-state devices, engines, computers in every direction and at all times. Scientists have come a long way in a little over 200 years.

In a sense, scientists have succeeded to the role of the ancient priesthood. In days when the universe seemed ruled by gods and demons, the priests knew the spells, incantations and prayers needed to keep the universe on its rails, and to make sure it would remain in harmony with human needs. Now, when the universe seems to be run by invariable relationships called "laws of nature," it is the scientists who know the equations, symbols and instruments required to keep the universe in line.

The difference is that there was no way of keeping tabs on the priests. Their universe did not run on a reasonable basis because the motivations of supernatural entities were inscrutable by definition. "Have faith" was the watchword. If the priests failed to keep the universe convenient for humanity, the failure was not theirs but that of the population itself for "sinning" or for "lacking faith." Or perhaps it was not failure at all but the inscrutable "will of the gods."

But scientists deal with a universe built on strict, rational principles that can be expressed in firm mathematical form and that—in theory, at least—is accessible to all. If, as a result of science, an element of inconvenience and danger is introduced into the universe, there can be no question in anyone's mind but that science and scientists are at fault. There is no one else to blame.

Science and scientists produced poison gas in World War I and the nuclear bomb in World War II. The dangers of modern war weapons and of peaceful nuclear technology are universally perceived to have been grounded in the work of scientists. Even the dangerous side-effects of processes intended solely for useful and constructive purposes are seen as the product of scientists. Good intentions count for nothing. The carcinogenic properties of new compounds intended for industrial applications, for dyes, for medicinals; the poisonous wastes inevitably produced by many useful chemical processes; the exhausts of autos; the energy waste of our gadgetry—all are put down as black marks against science and scientists.

As a result, there is a growing ambivalence toward science in the contemporary world. More and more people are entertaining the view of science-as-destroyer, and dream of returning to a never-never pastoral world that exists only in their romantic longings. Even those who cling to the older view of science-as-savior find it increasingly difficult to deny the darker side of scientific progress, and are lost in confusion as to what to do. Well, then, what do we do?

To begin with, we must understand that we can't abandon scientific advance. Whether we'd be better off had we never started is not worth arguing, for we did start. World population is now four or five times as large as can be supported without advanced technology, so we cannot simply let go unless we are willing to see some 3 billion people die in misery and our social structure collapse. And, if we wish to support the world by means of a smaller, cleverer, more people-oriented technology, we have to develop it first by means of scientific and technological advances, spawned and applied by scientists and engineers.

The knowledge that scientific advance cannot be abandoned must not give scientists false confidence. They must not feel that they are too necessary to be assailed, that they can be rigidly indifferent to public

clamor. They dare not assume the role of an invulnerable priesthood, for they have no supernatural beings to hide behind. If they are perceived as being aloof and unreachable, that could so inflame the passions of the multitude that scientists, science and ultimately the multitudes themselves will be destroyed in a passion of suicidal rebellion. Scientists must therefore—for everyone's sake, including their own—concern themselves intimately with the possible consequences, both practical and moral, of the work that they do. They must welcome public concern and share it; after all, they, too, are part of the public. It is the public purse that supports most of their work and the public from which they recruit the cadre for future generations of scientists. As for the public, its concern and its reactions must not be based on ignorant emotion alone. Of the millions who watch sports events, a vanishingly small percentage can play any of the games that they watch with anything approaching professional skill, yet virtually all understand the rules well enough to appreciate what they see. The public must then, in the same way, understand science if it is to react intelligently.

The conclusion, then, is that every scientist must be a publicist for science and a teacher of science every moment possible. And every member of the public who wishes to participate in the decision that might save or destroy the world must learn all he can about science in order to have a reasonable chance of placing the weight of his opinions on the side of salvation.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO REG MANNING— PULITZER PRIZE-WINNING CARTOONIST

**HON. ELDON RUDD**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● **Mr. RUDD**. **Mr. Speaker**, after more than 56 years of editorial cartooning and publication of more than 15,000 of his drawings from coast to coast, the Arizona Republic's Pulitzer Prize-winning cartoonist Reg Manning has announced a reduced work schedule.

To those of us who are privileged to know and love Reg Manning, it is perfectly in character for him not to retire completely. He will continue to draw occasional cartoons, and to do his incomparable copper wheel crystal engraving, which is recognized as among the best throughout the world. At 75 years of age, Reg still exudes tremendous energy and his famous warm smile, which have always been his hallmark. Age has not slowed Reg down one bit. As he once said with characteristic wit:

Being 75 doesn't make me feel old. What makes me feel old is when some old guy comes up and says he used to go to school with my son.

Reg Manning's first newspaper cartoons appeared in the Phoenix Gazette in 1924. At the height of his cartooning career, Reg was syndicated by McNaught Syndicate, and his cartoons appeared in more than 175 newspapers nationwide. He won the Pulitzer Prize in 1951 for his memorable cartoon, "Hats," which showed a bullet-pierced



helmet atop a cross in Korea in contrast to the silk top hats of United Nations diplomats at Lake Success. Manning cartoons have also won 16 awards from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., including two Abraham Lincoln awards, the Freedoms Foundation's highest award.

Syracuse University in New York has established a Reg Manning collection in its library in recognition of his outstanding past and future accomplishments, for which Reg has donated more than 5,000 original cartoons valued at more than \$150,000. Other Manning cartoons have been donated upon request to Huntington Library, Huntington, Calif.; the Peter Mayo collection at the University of Missouri; the National Center of the Cartoon and Graphic Works in Washington; the estate of Bernard M. Baruch; the Pulitzer Prize trustees collection at Columbia University; the late President Lyndon B. Johnson; and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who has one of the largest collections of Reg Manning cartoons.

Mr. Speaker, numerous laudatory newspaper and magazine articles have been published about Reg Manning's outstanding career as an editorial cartoonist. One which marked his 50th anniversary as cartoonist for The Arizona Republic in Phoenix was especially good, and I would like to include it in tribute to this great American at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Arizona Republic, May 1, 1976]

REG MANNING MARKS 50 YEARS ON JOB

(By Earl Zarbin)

Cartoonist Reg Manning marks the 50th anniversary today of his employment at The Arizona Republic.

But, if he is running any slower than he was when he joined the newspaper as a 21-year-old aspiring comic strip creator, that is difficult to detect.

The ideas, the drive, the energy, the sense of humor, which have made him one of the nation's foremost political cartoonists are still apparent.

His readiness to laugh, to smile, to share his joy and happiness, express better than words what has been involved in the art he has created in many forms—cartoons, fabrics, stationery, postcards, Christmas cards, jewelry, books, comic strips, watercolors and glass engravings.

There are other arts, those of living, of being husband, father, parent, helpmate, which are happily attested to by Ruth, his wife of almost 60 years, their son, Dave, and Dave's family.

Manning is a public man. Six days each week, excepting Sundays, some of what it is that makes him tick appears in his editorial cartoon on Page 6 of The Republic.

To the right of his signature is his trademark—a cactus with a face. The cactus-face expression often provides a further comment on the cartoon subject.

Since his first editorial cartoon appeared on the front page of The Republic in June, 1926, Manning has produced about 14,000 cartoons.

One, "Hats," printed Dec. 14, 1950, brought him a Pulitzer Prize in 1951. Pulitzer Prizes are awarded annually for the best work in fields such as poetry, cartooning, editorial writing, foreign reporting, local reporting, photography and music.

Gerald W. Johnson, writing in the book, "The Lines Are Drawn," about life in the United States since World War I as reflected in Pulitzer Prize cartoons, said that "Hats has a strong claim to be called the most characteristically American cartoon in the series, for it reflects the very strong American prejudices against both war and diplomacy. . . ."

At the time of the Pulitzer award, Manning's six-a-week political cartoons appeared in 116 newspapers, including three foreign publications, through the McNaught-Syndicate. He also drew two cartoons each week specifically for The Republic.

Before he retired from syndication in 1971, ending a 23-year association with McNaught, his cartoons appeared in 170 American newspapers and in a dozen foreign countries.

Manning arises about 6 or 6:30 a.m., showers, prepares his own breakfast, reads the newspapers and then thinks of a cartoon. He said he plays the radio and television constantly so that he can be aware of any spot news.

Sometimes he gets two or three ideas at once, saving some for use on succeeding days.

When he has an idea, he said, he tries "to draw it on the basis that I was debating with a friend who disagreed with me and we could still be friends afterwards."

"There are two or three things I try to do in . . . an editorial cartoon," he said. "I try to visualize my reader as somebody who has had to work like heck all day and didn't have a chance to read the story or hear the radio."

"So in my editorial cartoon, I try to tell him what happened, who it was it happened to and my opinion of whether it was right or wrong."

"I once suggested to a group of publishers that it was the cartoon that pulled readers to the editorial page instead of the editorials to the cartoon," Manning recalled. "They didn't like that idea very much."

When he drew "Hats," he said he had in mind "that they were doing a heck of a lot of talking in the United Nations without accomplishing very much, and they weren't doing any talking in Korea where this guy was getting bullet holes through his helmet."

He said he also had in mind Will Rogers' comment that "We never lost a war or won a conference." (Rogers died in a plane crash in Alaska, Aug. 16, 1935.)

Manning will work two or three hours on a cartoon. When he completes it, he turns to his second occupation, copper-wheel engraving on crystal.

He has become so engrossed with this art form, which he calls sculpture in reverse, that it has "ruined my golf game."

In fact, when he gave up his syndicated cartooning "because it wasn't profitable enough," he was prepared to quit cartooning entirely.

He said, "If I had quit, I could do writing and would have no trouble at all with my glass. I have so many things to do I'll never get them done."

Manning said he derives half of his income from his crystal etching. He said he has received as much as \$8,500 for two of his etchings. The minimum price for his work is \$400.

Hundreds of hours can go into a single piece of work, he said.

But instead of devoting himself exclusively to etching and writing, he returned to The Republic's payroll as its political cartoonist.

Manning had gone off the payroll in 1948, because the late Eugene C. Pulliam, who bought The Republic and The Phoenix Ga-

zette in 1946, didn't want to continue the Phoenix Republic and Gazette Syndicate.

Manning's cartoons were the only thing marketed by the syndicate, which was started in 1935 for that purpose. When Manning ended his formal status at The Republic to join the McNaught Syndicate, it also meant the end of "the Big Parade," a full-page cartoon feature published every Sunday by the newspaper from October 1926 to April 1948.

The Big Parade was "a cheery folksy hodgepodge of cartoons about local affairs," and it "had considerable power." This description of the page was provided in later years by Bill Mauldin, a two-time Pulitzer Prize-winning cartoonist, who was then a high school student living in Phoenix. Mauldin's career subsequently was followed in The Big Parade.

In his book, "The Brass Ring, A Sort of a Memoir," Mauldin credited Manning with giving him a hand. He wrote:

"Phoenix had an editorial cartoonist named Reg Manning who had established a national reputation. I began visiting Reg shortly after my arrival in Phoenix. He was kind and encouraging. His own eminence in the city gave me a clue that some of the fringe rewards of this profession might be as much fun as money."

Manning, two years out of Phoenix Union High School, was working as a free-lance artist when Temple Emery, manager of an engraving company, encouraged him to seek a job as artist on The Arizona Republican (as The Republic was then named.)

After four months of campaigning for the job, Manning was hired as a combination artist and staff photographer. The newspaper had never had a staff photographer before, and in Manning's view it still didn't.

But he took pictures and embarked on an eight-column cartoon strip that developed into "The Big Parade."

He also pursued his dream of drawing a syndicated comic strip, which never quite materialized.

Meantime, Manning was involved in many other pursuits among them the creation of cartoon fabrics and the writing of books. The cartoon fabrics were started at the suggestion of a retail merchant named Barry Goldwater.

"The year I graduated from high school, Goldwater was president of the freshman class, so I've always thought of him as President Goldwater," Manning said.

Manning's books include "What Kinda Cactus Izzat?," first published in 1941 and now in its 27th printing; "What Is Arizona Really Like?" a revision of his "Cartoon Guide of Arizona," first printed in 1938; "From Tee to Cup," a book on golf with a hole through every page, published in 1954; and "Little Itchy Itchy," which consists mainly of World War II cartoons.

Little Itchy Itchy was a small character who followed the Japanese emperor around with a sharp knife suggesting that the time had come for the latter to commit hara-kari.

Manning was born Reginald West Manning April 8, 1905, in Kansas City, and arrived in Phoenix with his widowed mother and older brother, Everett, in 1919.

His only art training came in high school, where he made drawings for the school annuals and the weekly "Coyote Journal."

Manning began The Big Parade a few months after joining the newspaper. Publisher Wesley Knorrpp agreed it was a good idea to have a news strip based on cartoons and the first one filled about a third of a page across eight columns.

Although his first political cartoon appeared within the first two months after he joined the newspaper, he only did an occasional one until 1934.

In the spring of that year, Manning, the late E. D. Newcomer, the paper's first full-time photographer, and the late Harvey Mott, a reporter and subsequent managing editor, made what was termed "The Friendly Survey of Arizona."

They made four separate trips, spending 42 days gathering stories, photographs and cartoon ideas. They camped out at night. On one of these occasions while in northern Arizona, Manning and Mott got into a campfire discussion about editorial cartooning.

Mott contended that someone without a college background couldn't be a political cartoonist. Manning disagreed, and took Mott's words as a challenge.

Manning drew a cartoon dealing with a San Francisco labor strike and called it, "I Cover The Waterfront." The spectral figure of death haunting the docks was printed on The Republic's front page.

The cartoon was reproduced in many newspapers and in Editor and Publisher, a publishing industry journal. Manning started drawing one cartoon per week, but his production was soon up to three weekly, then daily. In 1935, the Phoenix Republic and Gazette Syndicate started. When it ended in 1948, Manning's cartoons were appearing in 70 newspapers.

To maintain that type of production, seven cartoons plus The Big Parade, he worked long hours. He recalls that The Big Parade took about 24 hours to produce.

Cartoon ideas have come rapidly to Manning—"If I couldn't think of ideas rapidly I would have been out of business a long time ago"—but he couldn't think of anything to draw the day Will Rogers and Wiley Post were killed in the 1935 plane crash in Alaska.

But Manning came up with another thought. The Republic, as it does today, was publishing the "Will Rogers Says" feature. Manning wrote some words in the style of Rogers and added the caption, "As He'd Have Said It." He placed a black border around it and the paper published it the size of a normal editorial cartoon.

Manning said this effort drew more mail than any cartoon he has drawn.

He has received requests for the original cartoon from many of the people portrayed in his work. President Lyndon B. Johnson had more than 60. The largest collection is owned by Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz.

The walls in Manning's studio are covered with autographed photographs of a number of political figures and original cartoons from some of the greats in his profession.

He also has preserved every Big Parade and editorial cartoon that has been published. They are in bound volumes. His wife is responsible for maintaining this record of his work.

Three thousand of his original cartoons were donated to Syracuse University.

Manning has received many awards, including 16 from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa. They include Abraham Lincoln awards for 1970 and 1971, the highest award presented by the Freedoms Foundation.

He said the most useful award he has received is the silver T-square presented to him in 1951 by the National Cartoonists Society at a dinner in New York.

In accepting the T-square, Manning said, "I'd rather receive a nod from this particular group than from any university in the world, because these men are people I've admired all my life."

Strangely, no university has seen fit to give him "a nod" in the form of an honorary degree.●

BERNARD S. JEFFERSON

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to a most distinguished American jurist on the occasion of his retirement from the bench.

Presiding Justice Bernard S. Jefferson has devoted himself steadfastly to improving the quality of the legal profession. His career records a steady succession of achievements in support of this aim and his numerous, significant contributions in the fields of law have earned him wide recognition and high praise from professional colleagues. I wish today to add my respect to theirs for his nearly 50 years of service and leadership.

Justice Jefferson took his A.B. from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1931. He earned his LL.B. cum laude at Harvard in 1934 and a S.J.D.—doctor of juridical science—degree there in 1943. He was professor of law at Howard University Law School in Washington, D.C. from 1934 to 1946. From 1947 to 1959 he served as Assistant General Counsel, Office of Price Administration. He has been a member of the California bar since 1934. He is also a member of the American Bar Association, the Los Angeles County Bar Association and Langston Bar Association.

Justice Jefferson was appointed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Sr., as judge of the municipal court in December 1959, as judge of the superior court in May 1960, and was elevated to the court of appeal by Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in September 1975.

He has written articles published in various legal journals and is author of California Evidence Benchbook, published in December 1972 by the Continuing Education of the Bar, for which Justice Jefferson prepared two later supplements, and is in wide use in educational programs on the law of evidence and is a popular reference volume among trial judges and lawyers in the State of California.

The recipient of numerous awards for his contributions as legal author, scholar, judge, and teacher of judges, Justice Jefferson has also found time to render civic service in various capacities for organizations in California and at the national level. A partial listing includes: a 6-year presidency of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Urban League, district commissioner of the Boy Scouts of America for 8 years, member of the board of directors of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, member of the board of directors of the Welfare Planning Council of the Los Angeles Region, and member of the national board of directors and its executive

committee of the National Council of YMCA's.

Justice Jefferson's distinguished legal career and civic service together constitute a most remarkable contribution by a citizen to his State and Nation.

It is for this contribution that I wish to accord him my sincere respect and honor.●

DR. DONALD L. CUSTIS

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues are aware that a hearing was held on agent orange last Thursday by the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I was appalled to learn that it was suggested at that hearing that the Veterans' Administration's Chief Medical Director, Dr. Donald L. Custis, should be forced to resign.

That such an ill-advised action should even be suggested reflects one's total lack of knowledge about VA's efforts on the agent orange question, and one's total unfamiliarity with Dr. Custis as a person. I wish now to set the record straight about Dr. Custis by relating my own experience with this gentleman in my capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Dr. Custis has appeared many times before the committee as the spokesman for the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery. His testimony has always been of the very highest quality, and his responses to the committee's questions were forthright, knowledgeable, and complete. Dr. Custis' executive abilities, as well as his consummate medical knowledge was clearly in evidence when he appeared before us. In addition, in many informal meetings with Members and the professional staff, Dr. Custis has always maintained an open dialog and conducted himself in a thoroughly cooperative manner.

There is no doubt in the mind of any informed and fair-minded person that Dr. Custis has wholeheartedly involved himself and his staff in getting at the truth about agent orange. He has established a single point of contact on this issue in the person of Dr. Barclay Shepherd, who reports solely and directly to him. In May of this year, he convened a 3-day meeting in Silver Spring, Md., attended by more than 200 VA executives from throughout the country. The sole subject of this meeting was agent orange and how to respond compassionately and effectively to veterans' concerns.

Dr. Custis was commanding officer of one of the busiest hospitals in Vietnam—the U.S. Naval Hospital at Da Nang. He, himself, may have been ex-



posed to defoliants and other chemicals. To impute to him insensitivity and lack of concern for Vietnam veterans is the height of insensitivity.

I think that this current attempt to discredit Dr. Custis is indicative of much of the controversy surrounding Agent Orange. Reason and scientific inquiry have been subordinated to emotional charges of bureaucratic bungling and coverups. And now, we have apparently come to a demand for the discharge of a decent, honorable, and effective chief medical director.

I am delighted that the Administrator of the VA, Max Cleland, intends to ignore this ridiculous demand for Dr. Custis' resignation. That it was ever made reflects more unfavorably on the knowledge of the proposer—not Dr. Custis.

There follows a copy of the Administrator's letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, informing the chairman that he will not seek Dr. Custis' resignation. It is the correct, quick response which we all expected:

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., September 25, 1980.

HON. BOB ECKHARDT,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the hearing this morning before your Subcommittee concerning American servicemen's exposure to Agent Orange while in Vietnam, serious criticisms were directed toward Dr. Donald L. Custis, my Chief Medical Director, followed by a request that I seek his resignation. I believe these attacks were totally uncalled for. Moreover, I cannot comply with the request to seek Dr. Custis' resignation.

Don Custis has demonstrated during a long career of service to this Nation a commitment to the highest quality of medical care. He had a distinguished career in the Navy culminating in his selection as Surgeon General in 1973, in which capacity he served until his retirement in 1976. He is as decent and sensitive a human being as I have ever met. He is concerned about the good of all mankind as well as this Nation's veterans. He is committed to trying to find a fair and just solution to the Agent Orange controversy—a controversy which, unfortunately, has some of the same stigma, conflict and emotion that was associated with that whole chapter in American history related to Vietnam.

I wish the answer to some of the questions that we have all raised with respect to the Agent Orange controversy could have been resolved long before now. I wish the scientific community could resolve their differences with respect to the effect of Agent Orange on human beings. More importantly, I hope and pray that if those answers can be found, and if it is determined that this Nation has additional responsibilities to meet because of past actions, we do so as soon as possible and with total justice for all involved.

You can be assured that Don Custis and I will work together to see this issue to its end. I do not believe, however, that personal attacks such as occurred this morning help our efforts.

I request that this letter be placed in the official hearing record.

Sincerely,

MAX CLELAND,  
Administrator.

LOIS AND DICK GUNTHER—  
BRANDEIS-BARDIN INSTITUTE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1980, the Brandeis-Bardin Institute will present its prestigious Shlomo Bardin Award to Lois and Dick Gunther, a unique couple whose association with the institute dates back more than 20 years.

Lois and Dick Gunther share a life of commitment both to Judaism and to the community at large. Their collective achievements over the years and their contributions to both Jewish and secular life are matched by few.

Lois Gunther is currently on the steering committee of the Catholic-Jewish Women's Dialogue; is immediate past chairwoman and is on the executive board of the interreligious committee, Los Angeles chapter of the American Jewish Committee, as well as a member of the board of directors of Brandeis-Bardin. She also serves on the advisory committee of the Hebrew Union College School of Jewish Communal Service; is enrolled in the parashanic program at Congregation Valley Beth Shalom in Encino, and is active in three important committees of the Jewish Federation Council of Los Angeles.

Dick Gunther is on the board of trustees of the California School of Professional Psychology; is a member of the California Governor's Council on Wellness and Physical Fitness; and is chairman of the Los Angeles Jewish Federation Council Study Group—a "think tank" activity focused on the future of the Los Angeles Jewish community. He is vice chairman of the board of Brandeis-Bardin and served as the institute's president in 1978. Dick was founding chairman of the Council on Jewish Life; a past member of the board of directors of public television station, KCET, and a past member of the Los Angeles County's Economy and Efficiency Commission.

Both Lois and Dick Gunther are very much involved in the Jewish Federation Council's Project Renewal in Israel. Dick serves as Los Angeles committee chairman in this international program which matches diaspora communities throughout the world with deprived neighborhoods in Israel. Lois also serves on this committee which works toward achieving a combination of physical and social renewal.

Lois and Dick Gunther through their years of dedication to humanitarian causes and promoting understanding based on ethical principles are most deserving recipients of the

Shlomo Bardin Award. I ask the Members to join me in congratulating Lois and Dick Gunther on their achievements and to wish them and their sons Mark, Andy, and Danny, many years of future success and fulfillment.●

PROMOTION OF FILBERTS

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, I introduced legislation to aid the promotion of filberts. I want to take this opportunity to explain the purpose of this bill.

H.R. 8158 amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for filberts. H.R. 8158 gives the Filbert Marketing Order Committee the authority it needs to amend the marketing order so it is then permitted to levy an assessment on handlers to generate funds for research, promotion, and advertising.

This legislation provides an excellent opportunity for the promotion of filberts as there is a need to strengthen our domestic markets for this commodity. U.S. filberts are produced on 25,000 acres in Oregon and Washington and only account for 55 percent of the filberts the United States consumes. By furthering the promotion of filberts, H.R. 8158 would help increase domestic consumption.●

"RAGE"

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a unique film that was aired last week on the NBC television network. The movie, "Rage," explored the sensitive subject of sex offenders and how a correctional institution deals with them.

I am especially proud that the movie reflects the leadership taken by the State of New Jersey's Parole Board and Department of Corrections in this area. "Rage" is based on the treatment efforts at the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center in Avenal, N.J. It tells the story of the inmates and the professional corrections and parole personnel, in what critics have judged to be an amazingly accurate account of the sex offender and the treatment he receives.

Mr. Speaker, the center at Avenal is worth noting, and I am encouraged that NBC made the effort so successfully. Opened in February 1976, the

center treats repetitive-compulsive sex offenders who fall within the purview of New Jersey's special sex offender law. The 191 inmates at the facility have been convicted of offenses that range from rape to lewdness, and have sentences which range from 3 to 30 years. Before ADTC opened, sex offenders were housed in prisons and mental hospitals. In fact, this facility is the only correctional institution in the Nation devoted solely to the treatment of sex offenders.

"Rage" was truly a cooperative effort, with ADTC's superintendent, Dr. Ira Mintz and Assistant Superintendent Thomas Farrell and others offering technical advice to the producers. David Soul, the principal actor in the film, spent several days with the inmates in Avenal last spring, and George Rubino, the writer, spent 6 weeks at the institution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is instructive that this film focuses on one of society's most serious problems while providing a candid look at the dedicated professionals in New Jersey who are addressing the problem of the sex offender.●

#### TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE DUNCAN

#### HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1980

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, you hate to see a good man with the talents of Representative DUNCAN leaving the House of Representatives. It is not often you find someone who is an expert in all phases of transportation, including base running.

Bob has served his State and his Nation with distinction. The folks of Oregon's Third District have been ably represented and those of us who have been privileged to work with this multifaceted guy have enjoyed his good nature and friendship and the range of his interests as well as have benefited from his legislative skills.

Of course, I have to close by commenting on Bob's grace under fire—on the playing field as well as in the committee hearing room and on the floor of Congress. I must admit that the phrase "faster than greased lightning" is not the description that springs to mind. There is, however, some phrase, about "molasses," but let us just leave it at that.

I'm going to miss my good friend BOB. I know a lot of us are because he is a great guy. I wish him the very best in the future—it is no less than he deserves.●

#### REAUTHORIZE THE COMMITTEE ON WAGE AND PRICE STABIL- ITY

#### HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Council on Wage and Price Stability. I voted for this bill because I believe that it can be the focal point for coordinated action on the crucial wage-price front in the battle against inflation.

Certainly, there are many factors which contribute to inflation. Government spending plays a part, high priced energy plays a part and slow productivity growth plays a part. However, if we are going to make serious progress against the underlying rate of inflation, which is estimated at between 8 and 10 percent, then we must also prevent the wage-price spiral from twisting upward further. The Council has had an important role in this effort by virtue of its establishing and overseeing wage-price guidelines for the past 2 years.

It would be easy for someone to look at the record of the economy and conclude that since inflation has increased while the guidelines have been in effect, then they must have been ineffective in controlling inflation. However, I believe that this is too simplistic an analysis. First of all, to say that inflation increased while the guidelines were in effect begs the question of whether it would have increased even more without the guidelines. Second, and more important, the fact that these guidelines have been less than totally successful does not discredit the guideline concept itself. Rather it points out areas which can be improved in the development and implementation of the guidelines.

The Council has recently announced that it has postponed issuing the wage-price guidelines for the third year of the program until January. I would hope that during this time the Council will look for ways to put teeth into the guidelines. In an effort to do that, I would recommend that it look to legislation which I have introduced, H.R. 4752. This bill provides, among other things, for an anti-inflation factor to be used in determining the level of the guidelines. The purpose of this factor would be to make sure that the guidelines do not permit wage and price increases which merely accept the level of inflation instead of trying to make inroads against it. By having the guidelines set at substantially less than the increase in the cost of living, they will set a standard aimed at reducing inflation instead of just staying even with it. I would like to see guidelines set to reduce inflation by 20 percent or so a year until it has been eliminated.

H.R. 4752 would also give the President the power to achieve compliance with the guidelines by giving him the authority to cut off Government contracts to businesses which exceed the guidelines in either their prices or their wage arrangements with their workers. This bill would also allow for the termination or suspension of Federal benefits to businesses or governmental entities which exceed the guidelines. In addition, a tax incentives policy might be tried to reward firms and work forces which stay within the wage and price guidelines. All of this is strong medicine, but I believe necessary if we are to restore credibility to the guidelines.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the reauthorization of the Council on Wage and Price Stability. I urge the Council to act administratively in a way that effectuates the spirit behind H.R. 4752.●

#### IRISH AFFAIRS COMMITTEE'S THIRD ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, September 27 marked the third anniversary of the founding of the ad hoc Committee for Irish Affairs.

I believe that the problems that exist in Northern Ireland cannot be eliminated until they are fully recognized and understood.

The statistics concerning the desperate poverty that pervades the six Ulster counties may not be well known, but they are nonetheless alarming. The present jobless rate among Catholics is two and one-half times that of Protestants. The level of unemployment is up to 35 percent in the Catholic ghetto of West Belfast. The Fair Employment Agency of Northern Ireland reported last year that the economic situation of the Catholics is getting worse; that is, the chances for a Catholic worker to be unemployed are now greater than they were a year ago.

In an August 1977 speech, President Carter called for peace in Ireland. He also tentatively offered economic aid if the hostilities ceased. But the policy of the U.S. Government regarding Northern Ireland has been one of benign neglect. For example, no definite proposals have been made on how peace can be achieved.

I do not mean to imply that the United States has the solution to Northern Irish difficulties. The final solution must come from Ireland because it is an Irish problem. But Irish Americans are the largest ethnic group in this country, and I believe it would be a disservice to them for the United States to lightly pass over the dilemma of Northern Ireland. One Congressman and one congressional



group has been working very hard to make sure that does not happen—MARIO BIAGGI and the ad hoc Committee on Irish Affairs.

For the past 3 years the committee, of which I am a member, has been trying to call attention to the severity of the problems afflicting Northern Ireland. The committee has steadily grown in size and influence. But the committee has never overlooked the objectives outlined by Congressman BIAGGI: To hold congressional hearings on the Irish question with particular attention placed on human rights violations; to try and reverse a State Department policy of denying visas for leading political figures from Ireland; and to try to give the President a broader perspective on the Irish question. Congressman BIAGGI and other committee members have tirelessly worked to achieve these goals.

Two of the committee's many accomplishments are the stopping of arms sales to the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the inclusion of a plank promoting peace, justice, and human rights for Northern Ireland in the 1980 Democratic Party platform.

But the committee's greatest contribution has been in making the U.S. Government and the American people aware of the gravity of the troubles in Northern Ireland.●

#### FRIEND OF THE WEST

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the recent assassination of former President Somoza of Nicaragua was dismissed with a shrug at our State Department. Spokesmen there could barely bring themselves to deplore his murder. However, not everyone has been fooled by what took place in Nicaragua as votes on the floor have shown. Our Department of State has an infamous record of destabilizing friendly governments only to replace them with anti-American governments as in the cases of Nicaragua and Iran. The consequences of such things are disastrous for the position of the United States and the free world. The editorial writer of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle is among those not confused by the situation and has published a very cogent editorial in the Thursday, September 18, 1980, issue. The editorial follows:

#### FRIEND OF THE WEST

The arm of international communism stretches a long way.

It sadly caught up with Anastasio Somoza, the pro-Western president of Nicaragua, who was deposed by a Marxist-backed revolution last year. He fled his Central American country, first to Miami and later to a sanctuary in Paraguay.

Yesterday, he was the victim of assassins. His family ruled Nicaragua for years, and he had many American friends. A graduate

of the U.S. Military Academy, he was a classmate of Rep. John Murphy, D-N.Y.

Somoza was betrayed by a Carter administration that denied his troops arms and equipment because he violated the President's strange "human rights" criteria. When he came to Miami, the Nicaraguan leader was welcomed by Murphy and another congressional supporter, Georgia 2nd District Rep. Dawson Mathis.

"Tacho," as he was known by his American friends, was an implacable foe of communism who let his country be used as a U.S. base for the ill-fated 1961 Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion designed to topple Fidel Castro. He was no Thomas Jefferson, and he ruled his country with a firm hand. But he properly warned that the Marxist beachhead established in his native land could be a tragic turning point in the war against Red subversion in the western hemisphere.

In the world's present critical struggle against the Communists, more leaders are needed like Somoza who will oppose them consistently to the end.●

#### PROPOSALS TO CONTROL WASTEFUL SPENDING

### HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, in the last year the General Accounting Office has listed 107 specific examples of unnecessary Federal expenditures resulting from waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement. The total level of unnecessary spending resulting from just these 107 findings and recommendations is nearly \$34.5 billion. In addition, studies conducted for the House Government Operations Committee have revealed that billions of the taxpayers' dollars are being pushed out in the final weeks of the fiscal year on questionable contracts, ill-considered grants, and other types of wasteful spending. Former Treasury Secretary Blumenthal has stated that year-end spending amounts to agencies "literally pushing money out the door with a wheelbarrow."

The magnitude of this problem requires constructive legislative action to insure that the Federal Government operates in a more prudent and responsible manner. First, direct congressional action must be taken to halt the year-end spending sprees by the Federal bureaucrats. The administration has clearly been unable to deal with this major problem on its own. I have repeatedly supported a number of successful amendments to the fiscal year 1981 appropriations bills which would limit total agency spending in the last 2 months of the fiscal year to 20 percent of its annual budget. These amendments will effectively limit the ability of the Federal agencies to give away any remaining funds at year-end so that the Congress will not trim their budgets the following year.

The General Accounting Office has also repeatedly stated that there is a pressing need to strengthen the budget execution and procurement

process since poor internal spending controls are the No. 1 problem in Federal agencies. I have cosponsored an important proposal designed to significantly strengthen the internal accounting and administrative controls maintained by every Federal agency. These systems would have to be evaluated on an ongoing basis and any identified weakness, would have to be promptly corrected. Every level of management in the agencies would be forced to participate in the process of assessing and strengthening the systems of internal accounting and administrative control. Each agency would be forced to take major steps to minimize fraud, errors, abuse, and Government waste. The Financial Integrity Act will focus additional pressure on those individuals in the agencies who are responsible for the accountability of every single tax dollar appropriated by the Congress.

Since most of the GAO recommendations are related to regular operational procedures within the Federal agencies, implementation of the Financial Integrity Act and the year-end spending limitations will produce substantial and continuing annual savings for the U.S. taxpayers. I am hopeful the Congress will move forward with these innovative proposals. By enacting these two measures, the Congress can really demonstrate its commitment to tightening the reigns on Government spending and making federally funded programs more responsive to the needs of the people they are intended to serve.●

#### LIBERALS WOULD HAVE POLITICS SILENCE RELIGION

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Patricia Harris is now the official hit person of the Carter campaign. Her first assignment was to accuse Governor Reagan of Ku Klux Klan sympathies. This was no accidental, offhand remark. It was a prepared statement with a planned purpose. The purpose was to draw attention away from Mr. Carter's dismal record in relieving black unemployment by outdated big Government programs.

In her second assignment as the administration's official hit person, Mrs. Harris compared fundamental evangelical Christians to the Ayatollah Khomeini. Strange because Andy Young likened him to a saint. Once again, this was no offhand remark, but a prepared statement with a planned purpose. As before, the purpose was to draw attention away from the real issue.

We should not waste time by discussing Patricia Harris' vicious Khomeini comparison. The devotion of America's evangelical Christian community to freedom is beyond question.

But we must address the real issue this latest hit person tactic was intended to obscure. That is the fact that President Carter has been the instrument of the liberal establishment in its drive to replace America's traditional values with a humanistic philosophy. It seeks to replace parental and religious guidance with bureaucratic and judicial authority. That is what has brought on the present political activity by conservative religious bodies.

I agree with Mrs. Harris that there is a powerful movement underway in this country to make us a kind of theocracy. There is indeed a powerful minority which seeks to impose its moral views on all of us. But that militant minority is not the Moral Majority. It is the liberal establishment, and the religion it seeks to impose on America is the secular religion of humanism. The Moral Majority wants freedom for our churches, homes, schools. The liberals seek bureaucratic and judicial control. The issues are clear.

Under this secular religion, there are no absolute values of truth, beauty, and goodness: There are only the shifting goals of the liberal political agenda. The individual is not a responsible moral agent, striving to subdue his own sins, but a social activist whose duty is to wallow in collectivist guilt for the alleged sins of his neighbors, his ancestors, and his entire civilization. The age-old virtues or personal morality—humility, diligence, and self-discipline—are replaced by the narcissistic urge to do my own thing. Every traditional source of moral authority—parents, churches, the Bible, the classics of Western literature—is ignored or downgraded, while gossiping talk-show hosts and pompous Naderites are regarded as inspired prophets. It is no wonder that an observer like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, whose knowledge of America comes mainly from television and journalism, sees our culture as profoundly decadent.

In order to impose these upside-down values on us, the liberal establishment must silence those who speak out in favor of our traditional Judeo-Christian morality. To do this, it has resorted to a campaign of shameless hypocrisy.

One slogan used by humanists to silence traditionalists is, "We must keep religion out of politics!" But when Pope Paul recently ordered two liberal Catholic priests, including a Member of this House, to abandon professional politics, that same establishment was outraged. This year we have watched the liberal establishment violently attacking conservative religious leaders for daring to discuss politics, while at the same time they were equally violent in attacking the Pope for directing priests to leave full-time politics.

Another theme of the humanistic attack is that, "The clergy should not try to impose its morality on our political system." Ten years ago, this same liberal establishment was equally

unanimous in declaring that the Fathers Berrigan were doing their duty as men of the cloth by trying to impose their moral views on our policy in Vietnam. Liberals have once again demonstrated that they believe in freedom of speech only if the speech is liberal. The Riverside Church in New York City and other liberal church forums have been used by leftist minorities like Martin Luther King and William Sloane Coffin to spew anti-American hate. But that was all right.

But the main thrust of the liberal attack against the right of conservative religious leaders to speak out is to insist that: "Religious leaders should not discuss political issues." This means that the moral judgment of government is final.

Liberals tell us that abortion has ceased to be a proper subject for religious discussion. This is because the Supreme Court decided the question on January 22, 1973. They tell us that conservative religious leaders lost the right to discuss the traditional role of women when Congress submitted the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the States for ratification. By the same token, once a bureaucratic regulation is issued, it becomes a political matter, not to be questioned by any conservative clergyman.

We have here nothing less than a wholly new religious doctrine: Not only must we render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, but Caesar must make all the decisions as to what belongs to him.

The doctrine that Caesar's authority over religion is absolute is one which, in its purest form, rules almost half of the world today in the form of international communism. America is the bulwark against that deadly enemy of all religions. Many religious leaders are deeply worried about our Nation's power to defend religious freedom from that international threat. Liberals insist they have no right to express that concern, because it is a political matter. Yet these same liberals cheer when a group like Network organizes Catholic nuns to lobby against the B-1 bomber or a Catholic nun chastizes the Pope for his traditionalist views on the family.

The Founding Fathers did not want a country ruled by organized religion. But they would be equally horrified by an America in which organized religion had no voice whatever. Liberals are engaged in a campaign to silence the Moral Majority in the name of the first amendment. If there is one thing that the first amendment was never intended to do, it was to silence anyone.

When traditional values are attacked in the political arena, proponents of traditional values have no choice but to fight back in the political arena. As columnist George Will puts it:

Now evangelical Christian groups, one calling itself the Moral Majority, are plunging into politics \* \* \*. More important than

the question of who gets what is the question of why so many people are aroused. The answer is: They have been provoked.

If one looks at each area where the Moral Majority is defending traditional values in the political sphere, one discovers that it is an area where secular humanists have been imposing their will for years. Columnist Meg Greenfield makes this point clear in her discussion of the Moral Majority:

Certainly there is a component of the growing right-wing reaction on social issues—I don't know how big—that fits this description. But there are also vast numbers of people sympathizing with the trend who are merely reacting in predictable, normal, and valid ways to various terrible features of modern life. And what interests me most is that, in a way, we asked for it. By "we" I mean that mild, moderate, liberalish majority that has been roosting near the center of the Nation's politics for years. Our first contribution to the phenomenon was the promiscuity and mindlessness with which we have made private-values questions Federal Government Business. The second was our flight from moral judgment in the face of some of our most gross handiwork.

Columnist Greenfield is well aware that not even her liberal credentials will protect her from the sort of hysterical ravings hit-person Harris resorts to:

We are even afraid sometimes to render negative judgments, knowing the illogical leap will at once be made by our listeners who suppose we are recommending repression of the deviates, illiberality and—it is always mentioned next—genocide.

In plain English, what we have here is a campaign of intellectual terrorism, conducted by the liberal establishment. The fact that this administration has thrown its weight behind that campaign shows not only its desperation in trying to hide the real issue, but its complete unconcern with common decency in doing so. ●

### 300TH ANNIVERSARY, FAIRFIELD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Fairfield Presbyterian Church of Fairton, N.J., upon the 300th anniversary of its establishment.

The Fairfield Church, organized by a group of Connecticut Puritans who settled in Cumberland County around 1660, has served the community since 1680. In 1706, at a meeting in Philadelphia, the church became a member of America's first Presbyterian district ruling body known as a Presbytery.

Today, the Fairfield Church maintains a congregation of approximately 100 members. Its numerous activities ranging from a Bible study group to a youth group are evidence that the Fairfield Church has remained a guiding light in the Fairton area for 300 years.



It is with great honor that I bring to your attention the rich American heritage of the Fairfield Church, a true American landmark.●

**FREEDOM FOR VICTOR AND  
BATSheVA YELISTRATOV**

**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a most deplorable violation of human rights in the Soviet Union. The Soviet rulers appear to be intensifying their campaign of persecution and oppression against the courageous Soviet Jews who express a desire to leave the U.S.S.R. in order to enjoy religious freedom. We who have constitutional guarantees of such freedom must do all we can to expose the harsh and cruel efforts of the Soviet rulers to suppress freedom of religion and religious beliefs and practices.

What we are witnessing is Soviet violation of human rights on a massive scale in the U.S.S.R.; violation of the Helsinki accords on human rights which the Soviets signed in solemn ceremony in 1975. We cannot permit these horrendous violations of human rights to continue unchallenged.

With that thought in mind, I ask my colleagues to consider the unfortunate history of Victor and Batsheva Yelistratov. In 1972, the Yelistratovs reached a critical decision. They would leave the U.S.S.R. because they were not permitted to practice their religion in freedom. They could not live as Jews in the Soviet Union. The Yelistratovs were refused permission to leave with no explanation. They have reapplied time after time, but each time permission was denied. If any explanation was given, and it was always given orally, not in writing, it was that Victor possessed military secrets.

Mr. Speaker, that is a clear fabrication. Victor's closest approach to military secrets was in his 2 years' service as a radio engineer in the U.S.S.R. Army. But that was more than 10 years ago. Denying permission to leave the U.S.S.R. on the grounds of possessing military secrets is—after so many years—a violation of Soviet law. And, of course, it is the most blatant violation of the Helsinki accords. All of this is bad enough, but the Soviet rulers are also pursuing a campaign of harassment and persecution of the most evil sort against the unhappy Yelistratovs. Their home is watched and bugged. Parcels sent to them rarely are received. Both Victor and Batsheva have been thrown into jail and beaten. Last year, Victor was summoned by the Soviets' notorious secret police—the KGB—for a talk. Two weeks later their apartment was searched and everything with the slightest Jewish content was confiscat-

ed. Recently, the Soviet regime has started to interrogate people about Victor, and it is feared he may meet the fate of Anatoly Shcharansky, who received similar treatment before his arrest and imprisonment.

Despite this ugly campaign of harassment and persecution, Victor and Batsheva continue to struggle for their right to live as free individuals and to speak out for their religious beliefs. They risk their lives daily to help others, and regularly visit and send packages to the prisoners of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, this tragic story of two Soviet Jews is not unique. Thousands of Soviet Jews are experiencing this same denial of their rights to religious freedom. We must protest these terrible violations of human rights. We must let the Soviet rulers know that we are aware of these violations, and make clear our determination to marshal world opinion against this persecution.

I invite my colleagues to join me in writing to Chairman Brezhnev on behalf of the Yelistratovs, demanding that they be granted the freedom they seek so courageously. The Soviet Union must respect the Helsinki accords on human rights. Until that goal is achieved, we must never rest in our efforts to end this cruel persecution of Soviet Jews.●

**GAO REPORT DISPUTES ADMINISTRATION CONTENTIONS REGARDING NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION**

**HON. TOM CORCORAN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office, in its September 22 report entitled "U.S. Fast Breeder Reactor Program Needs Direction"—report No. EMD-80-81—says that "recent studies as well as continued pursuit of breeder technology by other countries raise questions about the credibility \* \* \* of the administration's strategy of pursuing our nonproliferation goals."

There is ample evidence to support the GAO's statement on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I insert in the RECORD the section of the GAO report entitled "Current Strategy Not Achieving U.S. Nonproliferation Goals," as printed on pages 10 to 13 of the report. NASAP stands for nonproliferation alternative systems assessment program, INFCE stands for international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation, LMFBR stands for liquid metal fast breeder reactor, and GCFR stands for gas-cooled fast breeder reactor:

**CURRENT STRATEGY NOT ACHIEVING U.S. NONPROLIFERATION GOALS**

While the administration recognizes the need for nuclear power to supply domestic

energy needs, it also recognizes serious nuclear proliferation dangers inherent in handling, processing, and transporting nuclear fuels. Moreover, the administration contends that these dangers will be unnecessarily increased by the premature introduction of nuclear technologies that involve the recycling of weapons-usable nuclear materials, as do all breeder reactors. In an effort to discourage the further spread of nuclear weapons to other nations or subnational groups, the U.S. policy is to delay the development of the breeder and its supporting reprocessing technologies.

However, recent studies as well as continued pursuit of breeder technology by other countries raise questions about the credibility of the approach being taken by the United States. Since 1977 several studies have been done by various groups and organizations, including us, on the effects of breeder reactor development on U.S. nonproliferation goals. At least five of these studies—those done by the Congressional Research Service,<sup>1</sup> the NASAP study group, the INFCE study group, the Office of Technology Assessment,<sup>2</sup> and us<sup>3</sup>—concluded that no single path among known nuclear fuel cycles involving reprocessing is substantially less proliferation prone than another. Moreover, a highly influential report by the Ford Foundation issued in 1977<sup>4</sup> concluded that research on small production reactors would be a much more suitable and likely means for producing weapons-usable material than would reprocessing plants associated with a commercial power reactor fuel cycle. The Ford Foundation study noted that research on small production reactors would cost substantially less and take less time to construct; involve relatively simple rather than complex reprocessing technology; can yield a comparable number of explosive devices per year; and have much lower detectability of clandestine facilities. Indeed, it is a historical fact that all plutonium used for weapons to date has been produced in research reactors or special military production reactors; not from commercial powerplants. Furthermore, DOE officials told us that the information available to them suggests that this practice will probably continue.

Both the NASAP and INFCE studies concluded that no technical solution exists to the proliferation dilemma because all nuclear fuel cycles entail some proliferation risks. In addition, the reports pointed out that, with the exception of the conventional light water reactor without fuel reprocessing, other fuel cycles do not offer inherent proliferation advantages over the LMFBR. The INFCE study group went further than this by concluding that the nuclear material diversion risks encountered in the breeder reactor fuel cycle present no greater difficulties than the light water reactor with reprocessing or even the once-through or throwaway cycle over the long term. Further, the NASAP and INFCE groups concluded that institutional controls and multinational safeguards efforts are the best means for reducing worldwide nuclear proliferation risks.

While the administration had hoped its actions on the LMFBR program and CRBR would influence other nations to delay

<sup>1</sup> "Alternative Breeding Cycles for Nuclear Power: An Analysis," Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Oct. 1978.

<sup>2</sup> "Nuclear Proliferation and Safeguards," Office of Technology Assessment, June 30, 1977.

<sup>3</sup> "Nuclear Reactor Options To Reduce the Risk of Proliferation and To Succeed Current Light Water Reactor Technology," U.S. General Accounting Office, May 23, 1979.

<sup>4</sup> "Nuclear Power Issues and Choices," Ford Foundation, Mar. 1977.

breeder reactors until more proliferation resistant breeder technologies and more institutional arrangements could be developed, it does not appear to be working. Despite the urgings of the U.S. Government, breeder programs are proceeding in other nations. Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union are now operating LMFBR industrial-size plants and more are planned. Also, there are experimental breeder reactors operating in Germany and Japan. To be sure, substantial public dissent against breeder technology exists in these countries, but their governments appear convinced that expeditious development of the breeder reactor is necessary to meet their future energy needs.

Our earlier report<sup>3</sup> cited conversations with European nuclear program officials who believe that rather than discouraging others from entering the nuclear arena, the U.S. nonproliferation posture may have given other nations additional incentives to accelerate development of indigenous nuclear industries and to launch vigorous research and development programs and export promotions. This view has been validated in a February 1980 report<sup>4</sup> prepared by the minority staff of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs based on recent discussions with the energy officials in several European countries.

According to this report, the European view of the U.S. nuclear energy policy is that our failure to develop a breeder will put great pressure on the world uranium supply. Consequently, some of these countries are pursuing breeder development more vigorously than before because of the additional uncertainty in uranium availability. In addition, foreign officials have pointed out that U.S. withdrawal from a mission-oriented LMFBR program will leave the United States with little influence on international safeguards and controls over the sale and use of breeder reactors. The history of the U.S. involvement in the worldwide light water reactor industry seems to demonstrate the soundness of this premise. According to NRC officials, the heavy U.S. activity in light water reactor development over the past two decades enabled this country to lead the way in establishing more stringent safety and licensing practices for conventional nuclear reactors than might otherwise have resulted. These practices have since been adopted by many countries throughout the world.●

#### NAT INFURNA HONORED FOR KIWANIS SERVICE

**HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK**  
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Monday, September 29, 1980*

● **Mr. HOLLENBECK.** Mr. Speaker, on October 4, I will join the Kiwanis Club of Fort Lee, N.J., in honoring their outgoing president, Mr. Nat Infurna.

Mr. Infurna has served this active club with distinction. Under his leadership, club membership has risen by 23 percent, and the Kiwanis have continued in their fine tradition of community service. Needy and deserving

citizens of all ages and backgrounds—from students in need of scholarships for higher education to low-income elderly persons in need of a helping hand—have benefited from the endeavors of Mr. Infurna and the Fort Lee Kiwanis.

Also a leader in the Lions Club, the Republican Party, and in several aviation professional groups, Mr. Infurna is one of those rare individuals whose busy schedule can always be expanded, somehow, to include yet another public interest undertaking. For this, he has earned our gratitude and affection.

I am proud to offer Nat Infurna my congratulations on this well-deserved recognition of his achievements and to express my sincere appreciation for his continued efforts to make our communities a better place in which to live.●

#### ADOPTION EXPENSES TAX DEDUCTION BILL

**HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, September 29, 1980*

● **Mr. OBERSTAR.** Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow individuals a deduction for certain expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child. Deductible adoption expenses include necessary adoption agency fees, court costs, attorney fees, and related expenses.

Similar bills have been introduced in this Congress to provide for adoption expenses tax deductions but my bill differs from them in that it provides for such deductions only when the adoption has been arranged by a public welfare department or similar State or local public social service agency with the legal responsibility for child placement or by a not-for-profit voluntary adoption agency authorized or licensed by the State or local government to place children for adoption.

This stipulation on placements is an important step forward in the protection of the welfare of the child. The child's welfare should always be the primary consideration in placements. Independent adoption placements may be made by physicians, ministers, or attorneys in States which have not yet enacted authorization or licensing requirements. Yet, in these States, the child may also be placed by someone thoroughly unqualified to do so. These lax State laws allow for abuses by black-market operators. The victims of these placements are not only the children, but the birth parents and adoptive parents whose emotional and financial welfare may be traumatized.

Hearings during the 95th Congress examined the growth of blackmarket adoptions in the wake of drastic reductions in the number of adoptable chil-

dren. Those hearings spotlighted the need for more carefully crafted legislation to prevent abuses by unscrupulous interests. My bill, an outgrowth of those hearings, precisely defines those adoptions which will be eligible for tax deductions; it does so by prohibiting adoptions through nonlicensed entities or individuals. It is my intention that, through this incentive, some States will be encouraged to enact legislation prohibiting adoptions through individuals or entities not licensed by the State. The result of such combined Federal-State action will be adoptions made with the best interest of the child in mind and a more positive, constructive climate for adoption.

The adoption process is lengthy, time consuming and often expensive. Technical procedures and high costs are disincentives to parents hoping to adopt a child. This bill would encourage prospective parents hoping to adopt a child. This bill would encourage prospective parents in the adoption process. It will also aid in the placement of foster children into permanent homes and the placement of children with special needs.

The cost of foster care under aid to families with dependent children is estimated to exceed \$400 million this year. These costs could be considerably reduced if children could be placed in adoptive homes. In addition, many special needs children are hard to place; the search for qualified and caring adoptive parents for these children is both costly and lengthy. This bill would provide an incentive for the adoption of these children whose chances for placement are less than average.

I have drafted this bill after lengthy discussions with public welfare agencies, the National Committee for Adoption, the Child Welfare League in New York, and other groups interested in the welfare of children. I recognize that time is short in this session of the 96th Congress, and I have no illusions about prospects for action on the bill during the balance of this Congress. I do hope that a good number of my colleagues will join me as cosponsors of the bill and hereby set the stage for committee action early in the 97th Congress, when I shall reintroduce this bill.●

#### HONORING JOHN BATES

**HON. WILLIAM D. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, September 29, 1980*

● **Mr. FORD** of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay public tribute to John Bates, one of the most active citizens in my congressional district, who is being honored on October 25 by his fellow citizens.

A "Bash for Bates" will be sponsored at UAW Local 157 by the Inkster Democratic Club, which John has

<sup>3</sup> "The United States and International Energy Issues," U.S. General Accounting Office, EMD-78-105, December 1978.

<sup>4</sup> Report by the Minority Staff of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on a Trip to Several European Countries, February 1980.



served as president for the past 6 years.

John Bates was born 59 years ago in Leighton, Ala., the only son of Homer and Berdia Bates. He married Lula Pruitt in 1940 at Sheffield, Ala., where he worked for several years for the Reynolds Metal Co.

During World War II, John served in the U.S. Army for 2 years, then worked in a freight depot while attending night classes to finish his high school education.

In 1953, the Bates family moved to Inkster, Mich., where they have lived ever since. He began working that year for the Ford Motor Co., and became an early and active member of the United Auto Workers, serving 14 years as shop steward and committeeman. In recent years, he has been a vice president and assistant coordinator of the UAW CAP organization.

In 1968, John was elected a democratic precinct delegate, and has served continuously since that time. As a precinct delegate, he has earned a reputation as hard working and reliable. Voters throughout his precinct depend upon him for advice and guidance.

Six years ago, the Inkster Democratic Club was reorganized, and its members elected John Bates as president. He was also named vice president of the 15th Congressional District Democratic Organization.

Under his leadership, the Inkster Democratic Club became the leading political organization of the Inkster community, attracting new membership among all racial, ethnic, and age groups.

Through successful fundraising and social programs, the club has grown, acquired a clubhouse, and become a model for other clubs in the area.

Recently, due to ill health, John tendered his resignation as the club's president, but the members unanimously rejected it, insisting he remain as their leader.

Despite his total commitment and involvement with the club, his job and other activities, John Bates has maintained a close relationship with his wife, their five children and nine grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of John Bates and his accomplishments, and I am pleased to bring them to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress. ●

#### SOVIET AGGRESSION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA—PART I

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the question of Soviet involvement in southern Africa is always difficult to assess. However, a Soviet defector, Mr.

Igor Glagoler, who has firsthand knowledge of their activities and aims in southern Africa has written a paper on this subject containing some very new information showing the extent of Soviet interference. It appeared in volume I, No. 1, of the monthly bulletin of the Association for Cooperation of Democratic Countries entitled: "Democracy Against Socialism." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### DEMOCRACY AGAINST SOCIALISM

##### SOVIET AGGRESSION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The author of this study had a unique access to the decision making process in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Dr. Igor S. Glagolev was a senior research member of the Soviet Academy of Science—until October 1976, when he was granted political asylum in the United States. Working at the prestigious Institute of World Economy and International Relations and later at the Department of Foreign Policy of the Institute of History of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow, he was simultaneously a part-time consultant of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (which is the real government of the U.S.S.R.). Dr. Glagolev is the author of several books and numerous articles on the Soviet foreign policy published in many countries of Europe, America, Africa and Asia. He participated in hundreds of secret discussions at the Central Committee of the CPSU, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the General Staff of the Soviet Union. He authored dozens of confidential and open documents of the Soviet government.

Dr. Glagolev left the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics because of his strong opposition to the growing aggressiveness of the Soviet foreign policy and the persecutions of the participants of the movement for peace and democracy in the U.S.S.R. In the United States he founded the Association for Cooperation of Democratic Countries and organized several international conferences on Soviet aggression, Western response and freedom movement in the communist-dominated countries. His studies on SALT, the Soviet policy in Southern Africa and other international subjects have been published in Congressional Record (U.S.) and other periodicals in many countries, including South Africa. Prime Minister P. W. Botha and several members of the U.S. Congress quoted these studies during parliamentary debates.

##### SOUTHERN AFRICA—A VITAL PART OF THE FREE WORLD

Southern Africa is the most dynamic part of the free world. Important measures securing elected governments, human rights, economic progress and independent development are taken in this region almost every year. It is necessary to note the recent creation of new states with elected governments and free enterprise—Bophuthatswana, Venda and Namibia. We must also point out the suggested organization of councils representing the non-white population in the South African Republic, development of economy, education and science, as well as the higher standard of living in South Africa, compared to other African countries.

In contrast to the dictatorial and aggressive regimes of the so-called front-line state, which are subservient to Soviet imperialism, the above mentioned Southern African countries are truly independent and ready for cooperation with other countries. The social system of the South African Republic

and other Southern African countries is not ideal, but it is incomparably better than the social system of the Soviet Union, the front-line states and the whole Soviet bloc.

It is interesting to compare the situation in South Africa with the situation in the Soviet Union. The Soviet leadership has executed, starved to death or incarcerated more than one hundred million innocent people in Russia and other countries since the communist coup d'etat in 1917. South Africa, on the contrary, raised the standard of living of its population and secured many human rights for millions of its citizens.

The Soviet Union is an actual jail for its population; the country is surrounded by Soviet border troops, and nobody is allowed to leave it without special permission of the dictatorial regime. South African citizens, as a contrast, are free to leave the country, if they wish.

In fact, many citizens of the neighboring states come to work in the South African Republic because of the higher wages and better life there. Millions of citizens of the Soviet bloc, on the contrary, escaped from their countries to the free world because of the persecutions and the general low standard of living in the Soviet bloc. I am one of them.

Free enterprise, which is the basis of economic development in Southern Africa and the whole free world, is strictly forbidden in the Soviet Union. Many people, who tried to organize free enterprise and to raise the standard of living, were executed in the U.S.S.R.; in addition, millions of such people were sent to concentration camps there. At the same time, the Soviet dictators, the chiefs of the secret police and of the aggressive armed forces live in luxury, exploiting the working people of Russia and other countries.

While there are several political parties and several candidates for each elected office in Southern Africa, there is only one (communist) party in the Soviet Union, and there is only one candidate for each elected office there. It means that there is no choice, no free elections in the Soviet Union and other countries of the Soviet empire, including the front-line states.

The Soviet leaders openly or clandestinely are waging wars against the population of at least 17 countries: Afghanistan, Iran, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, Israel, Ethiopia, Chad, Morocco, Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala. They use not only Soviet troops—as in Afghanistan—but also local communist or pro-communist governments and armed forces. They use foreign communist parties, and pro-communist terrorist organizations (SWAPO, African National Congress, Polisario, Palestine Liberation Organization and other organizations).

I personally met in Moscow the leader of the South African Communist Party John Marks and representatives of the terrorists who afterwards came to power in Zimbabwe. These people came to Moscow asking for money, arms and instructions. Afterwards they organized the killing or mutilation with Soviet arms of many thousands of innocent men, women and children—black and white—in Southern Africa.

In contrast, to the aggressive Soviet policy, the democratic leaders of Southern Africa have a defensive policy. They try to resist systematic armed invasions from the front-line states, most of all from Angola.

Southern African countries, however, are in a very difficult situation, because Soviet aggressors use not only pro-Soviet govern-

ments or other dictatorial states, but also leftist Western politicians, the United Nations Organization and the Organization of African Unity.

Having established pro-Soviet dictators in many countries, the Soviet leaders are trying to do the same in Southern Africa: to topple the present elected governments and to install Soviet puppets.

Soviet policy makers, like the Gromyko family, openly describe the riches of Southern Africa which they want to acquire. Here are some tables of the enormous mineral resources of Southern Africa published in the book "Conflict in the South of Africa," which was written by Anatoliy Gromyko, director of the Institute of Africa in Moscow, the son of the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko.

#### SHARE OF SOUTHERN AFRICA IN WORLD PRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

Mineral	Percent
Gold.....	68.8
Diamonds.....	64.3
Cobalt.....	56.7
Chromium.....	31.5
Vanadium.....	29.4
Platinum.....	28.4
Antimony.....	27.9
Copper.....	22.0
Uranium.....	17.0
Manganese.....	14.4
Berillium.....	10.4

<sup>1</sup> Anatoliy Gromyko, Conflict in the South of Africa, International Aspect, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. Institute of Africa, Moscow, 1979, p. 30. (In Russian).

The South African Republic is especially important. It is in first place in the world's production of gold, jewelry diamonds, platinum, manganese, chromium, vanadium, zirconium and antimony oxides. Fifty-four minerals are mined in the Republic. At present, when South Africa is still free, this country is vital for the whole free world.

#### SHARES OF IMPORTS FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC<sup>1</sup>

(In percent)

	U.S.A.	West Germany	Japan
Chromium.....	25.2	40.7	31.6
Manganese.....	3.0	65.6	25.8
Antimony.....	16.3	n.a.	n.a.
Nickel.....	1.7	10.8	1
Diamonds.....	11.9	6.2	1.6
Uranium.....	8.3		
Mica.....		26.6	
Asbestos.....	6.3	14.5	30.9

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 32.

If the South African Republic is included in the Soviet sphere of influence, the U.S.S.R. will be able to deny all these strategic resources to the West.

It is ironic that Anatoliy Gromyko recognizes (unwillingly) the great industrial and technological successes of South Africa, when he writes that the South African Republic, with only 6% of the population of Africa, produces 50% of all the minerals and electric energy produced in the whole African continent. Usually Soviet propaganda writes only about "shortcomings" and "crimes" in South Africa.

In recent years Southern Africa has become one of the main targets of the Soviet military-political offensive.

#### WORLD DOMINATION—LONG-RANGE SOVIET GOAL

The present program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was adopted in 1961. The Institute of World Economy and International Relations, where I worked at that time, prepared several important parts

of this program. There were two main groups of the Soviet establishment then: an aggressive one and a moderate one. The moderate group, to which I belonged, stressed the rise of the standard of living and reduction of arms as the goals of the party. Several such points were included in the program. The second group, however, which was powerful in the Central Committee of the party, suggested different goals, first of all—world domination of "socialism", that is of the Soviet dictatorship. This group, to which Brezhnev, Suslov and other present Soviet leaders belong, included the following in the program: "Socialism unavoidably will succeed capitalism everywhere". Soviet propaganda uses the word "capitalism" when it mentions democratic countries. The Soviet leadership openly announced its goal to establish world Marxist dictatorship by means of force. "Dictatorship of the proletariat and leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Party are the necessary conditions of the socialist revolution and the creation of socialism," is written in the program.<sup>2</sup> The word "proletariat" is added for propaganda purposes; the working people have no rights in the Soviet bloc, which is governed by party bureaucrats.

The goal of world domination is obviously a long-range one. It is planned to achieve this goal in several decades. Now, two decades after the adoption of the program of the CPSU, about one-third of the world population is under domination or strong influence of the Soviet dictators. This domination has been achieved by force. Tens of millions of people were killed, starved to death or mutilated as a result of communist wars against the population of Russia, China, Indochina, Africa and other regions of the world.

Active preparation for the future conquest of Africa were made in the U.S.S.R. during the time that the program of the CPSU was written. The University of Friendship of Peoples was founded in Moscow in 1960. Eight thousand foreigners from the Third World (mainly from Africa) have already graduated from this "university" and have gone to Africa, Asia and Latin America to promote Soviet influence there. Seven thousand people are studying at the "university." They will go to 105 countries.<sup>3</sup> The present dictator of Angola, J. E. dos Santos, for instance, was educated in the U.S.S.R. in 1963-70. No wonder that he is now a Soviet agent of influence, who plays an important role in the organization of the cruel war not only against the population of Angola itself, but also against the population of South Africa.

The creation of the Institute of Africa in Moscow was another important step for the preparation of the Soviet conquest of Africa. Vassiliy Solodovnikov and Anatoliy Gromyko—successive directors of the Institute—took an active part not only in writing plans of this conquest, but also in practical aggressive actions in Africa. V. Solodovnikov was appointed Soviet ambassador in Zambia, where he masterminded and organized the takeover of Zimbabwe by the pro-Soviet terrorists of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe. Previously Solodovnikov, who is a high-ranking agent of the KGB (Soviet secret police), worked as an assistant of the Secretary General of the United Nations in New York. I was present at a secret meeting in Moscow in the middle of the 1960s when Solodovnikov described how he established

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> International Affairs, February 1980, Pp. 149-150. (In Russian.)

Soviet control over the staff of the United Nations.

The staff and activities of the Organization of African Unity are also strongly influenced by the Soviet leadership through the local pro-Soviet dictators. The Soviet leaders installed such dictators in the majority of the African states, which are now members of the United Nations, too, and help to promote Soviet influence there.●

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE CONABLE-MITCHELL - WYDLER - RODINO-WEISS AMENDMENT TO H.R. 7112

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to extend my cosponsorship of the Conable-Mitchell-Wydlar-Rodino-Weiss amendment, which will authorize State government participation in the general revenue-sharing program. Our amendment eliminates the entitlement, which currently exists for State governments, and directs participation in fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983 through the normal congressional budget procedure. The amendment does nothing more than provide the Budget and Appropriations Committees with the option to fund the State government portion of general revenue sharing.

I support the effort to include State share because trend data suggest a continuing decline in the fiscal portion of State and local sectors. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the fiscal year 1980 fiscal position of the State and local sector will continue to be in deficit. The 1980 deficit is expected to be larger than the 1979 deficit because expenditures are expected to grow about 9 percent while receipts increase by only 7 percent. The latest Data Resources, Inc. (DRI) forecast supports that trend with a projection of fiscal year 1980 State and local sector expenditures increasing by 8.5 percent while receipts increase by only 6.1 percent. The effect of H.R. 7112, as reported, would exacerbate this fiscal condition in cities. The proposed distribution changes would dictate that 12 percent of the cities receive from 10 percent to 50 percent increases in their current payments while 48 percent of the cities receive 10 percent to 50 percent decreases in their current payment. Providing an option for State participation will offer potential alternative or fiscal relief for cities in the outyears.

The issue of equity also surfaces when discussing the State participation in general revenue sharing. If that portion is not funded and acknowledging the project increases in expenditures, it becomes clear that States must make up, in many cases by law, the gap. If the election were to general additional revenue the most likely mode would be additional sales tax collections. The median State ac-

<sup>1</sup> Program of the Communist Part of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1976. (In Russian) p. 5.



counts for 56 percent of its generated revenue through the highly regressive sales tax mode. Poor people consume more than their average income through credit, consequently are taxed 100 percent of their income. To increase the rate of sales taxes would be to further burden the poor while the upper income shelter their earnings through tax expenditures.

It is also important to note that while State and local governments will receive \$91 billion in Federal aid in fiscal year 1980, accounting for nearly one-quarter of their general revenues, local governments also receive State passthrough money. States pass money, both Federal and State generated revenue, through the localities. The combined Federal and State intergovernmental transfers to localities accounted for over 40 percent of local government general revenues in fiscal year 1978. The typical large city generates 60 percent of the remainder with local property taxes and over 31 percent with sales taxes. Again, to avoid the regressive nature of sales taxes while providing large central cities with the opportunity to attract business growth with comparable property taxes, the State must be prepared to assist the large central city.

For the reasons I have outlined, it is imperative that this bipartisan amendment be considered on its merits by my colleagues.●

**NORMAN BLESHPMAN—A LEADER  
IN SERVING THE CAUSE OF THE  
HANDICAPPED CHILD**

**HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, the handicapped children of New Jersey are indeed fortunate to have in Mr. Norman Bleshman an outspoken advocate of their special needs and interests. Through his steady dedication and commitment, Mr. Bleshman is proud testimony to the accomplishments one man acting in the public interest can achieve. He has touched the lives of thousands upon thousands of handicapped children and their families, and his record of service, as outlined by the Special Services School District of Bergen County in grateful recognition of his leadership, is an inspiration I am proud to share with my colleagues—

Norman A. Bleshman, a lay leader in the founding of Special Services School Districts, assisted in the writing of the legislation, worked for its passage, and then was involved in the implementation and establishment of the Special Services School Districts.

He served as the first, third, fifth, seventh and now eighth president of the Board of Education of the Bergen County Special Services School District. Of all those involved in the founding, he is the only person who has continued his service throughout the eight years the Bergen County Special Services School District has

been in existence and has continually served in a leadership position.

Norman A. Bleshman, an engineer by profession, was initiated into his career in public education when he was elected to the Bergenfield Board of Education in 1962 for a three-year term. He was next elected for a three-year term in 1968. In these six years, he served as president once and vice-president twice.

In 1964, during his first term, he was appointed by Ruth Mancuso, of the State Board of Education, to serve on a New Jersey Federation of District Boards of Education committee, which studied the facilities available in New Jersey to serve its special education needs. This committee reported a severe lack of programs and facilities for special education and so, Norman A. Bleshman spent the next fourteen years untiringly trying to rectify this situation.

In 1965, he joined the New Jersey Association for Brain Injured Children and was appointed education chairman for the Northern section. As chairman, he convened a meeting with Rocco Montesano, the Assistant Superintendent of Schools of Bergenfield, and Dr. Archie F. Hay, Bergen County Superintendent of Schools to provide for nonexistent programs for the handicapped in Bergen County. They identified two of the most important needs as being vocational training which will lead to job placement and maintenance for the minimally handicapped, and a meaningful education for the severely handicapped. With the advice and counsel of the professional educators, Norman A. Bleshman proceeded to organize the community to work together to obtain a vocational training program and facility to serve the minimally handicapped. The need for this program was clear. The Brain Injured Children's Association was easily convinced to spearhead the drive for this program. They appointed a study group and he was elected chairman. The group first defined the specific needs and then sought the support of the Board of Chosen Freeholders. After the Board of Chosen Freeholders were apprised of these needs, they sought a broader base of interest and lay leaders concerned with the retarded, autistic and emotionally disturbed were added to an enlarged committee.

In preparing a report for the county government, Norman A. Bleshman researched all existing programs throughout the county. In Syosset, New York, he found an outstanding program that would meet the needs of Bergen County. He also contacted the State employment services in an effort to determine what occupations were in short supply in Bergen County and toward which training should be aimed. Bergen County industry was enlisted, and they supported this effort. Finally, the findings of this committee were submitted to the Freeholders, who then appointed a feasibility committee, which was made up of county professional leaders and the original lay committee. Norman A. Bleshman was elected chairman of this committee, which prepared a proposed program, curriculum, and budget and made a number of recommendations for operating a vocational program for children with special needs.

One recommendation—"to have this program administered by a County Board of Special Education" was withdrawn when it was realized that it would take 4 or 5 years to enact legislation to permit the creation of such a board. In March 1967, Norman A. Bleshman presented the final report of the feasibility committee to the Freeholders. Two months later, the report was officially acted upon when the Freeholders authorized Freeholder Eugene Francis and Norman A. Bleshman to present, on their behalf, a request that this program be established and operated by the existing

Bergen County Board of Vocational Education. After lengthy discussion, the program was accepted and an advisory committee was established by the Board of Vocational Education. Mr. Bleshman was elected to lead that committee, whose first assignment was to help select and screen candidates to administer the program. Their second assignment was to find a suitable building. A suitable building was purchased in November 1967. A director was hired and the program begun by April of 1968. Mr. Bleshman, today, continues his interest in this particular project by serving as chairman of the advisory committee for special needs schools of the Bergen County Vocational School District.

During the late 1960's, the New Jersey Association for Brain Injured Children became an affiliate of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. In 1970, Mr. Bleshman was elected chairman of the Northern Section, serving Bergen, Passaic and parts of Morris County. In that same period, he represented the N.J.A.C.L.D. at the New Jersey Interagency Council (for the Handicapped). In 1971, he took the lead in forming and chairing the Bergen County Interagency Council for the Handicapped. This group was composed of representatives of school districts and parent groups. They worked together to coordinate efforts to improve the position of the handicapped children, both in school and in the community.

While this was going on during the late 1960's, Norman A. Bleshman was leading an organized effort to form the "County Board of Special Education" which was recommended by the original county feasibility committee. This effort began the night that the Freeholders voted to issue bonds to purchase a building to house the first vocational program for children with special needs. With Freeholder encouragement, some of the dedicated lay and professional members of the earlier feasibility committee were joined by a representative of the County Cerebral Palsy Center to provide for the needs of the severely handicapped. Mr. Bleshman assumed the role of chairman of this group. Senator Matthew Feldman reacted quickly and introduced a bill to create a Board of Special Education for Counties just before he completed his term of office in 1968.

In 1969, the committee induced Senator Fairleigh Dickinson to sponsor the much needed legislation. Norman A. Bleshman developed the basic language for this bill which would establish county special services school districts. In addition, he and this committee worked to gain unified acceptance from county, state, parent and professional groups and legislators. These efforts were interrupted for almost a year when the then Commissioner of Education, Carl Marburger, was asked to have another study of the situation made. When Commissioner Marburger was convinced that there was no better means of providing for the severely handicapped, the Commissioner approved the committee's proposal.

The final efforts to obtain legislative approval resulted in the passage and signing of the bill to establish special services school districts on May 27, 1971. The committee continued to work for the establishment of a special services school district in Bergen County. On December 29, 1971, Norman A. Bleshman joined other committee members: Herbert Kahn, Dr. Archie F. Hay, Dorothy Webb, Dr. Phoebe Hudson as part of the first board of education of the Bergen County Special Services School District.

In 1972, Norman A. Bleshman was invited again to participate as an active member of the New Jersey School Boards Association Special Education Committee. That year, he was also asked to be a reactor on a panel concerned with special education at the National School Board Association convention.

He remains an active member of the New Jersey School Boards Association Special Education Committee. In 1975, he was elected to the Executive Committee of the Bergen County School Boards Association for a three-year term and initiated the County's Special Education Committee. In 1975, he was instrumental in creating the Council of Special Services School Districts, which consisted of members of the three Special Services School District Boards of Education in Cape May, Burlington and Bergen County. He is now serving his second term as president of that council which now includes Mercer County.

In 1970, the parents of the students at the Maplebrook School (a private residential school in Amenia, New York for learning disabled children) became concerned about the future of the children who completed the program at the school. In 1971, Norman A. Bleshman became president of the Maplebrook Parents Association, and during his term, the Association initiated what is now a well-known living facility in New Haven, Connecticut, which trains the students to live and work independently after graduation from this private school. The goal for these young adults will be the ultimate ability to live totally independent. In 1974, he joined those creating a similar Bergen County facility (Independent Living for Adults) as a member of their board of directors. He provided them with the benefit of his experiences at Chapel Haven in New Haven, Conn.

In December 1970, he was elected as a member of the Board of Directors of the Community Center for Mental Health, which serves 15 communities in New Jersey's mental health catchment area No. 47. He served during a period of heavy growth in both client and facility services. Because of the greater responsibilities of the Board of Education, Special Services School District, he resigned in August 1973.

In his community from 1957-1960, he served as member, secretary and chairman of the Bergenfield Zoning Board of Adjustment. In 1957, he founded and served as the charter president of the Greater Bergenfield Jaycees. Successively, he served the N.J. Jaycees as State Vice President, Chairman of the State Community Planning Committee and State Government Affairs Committee. From 1959 to 1964, he served as the founder and president of the Bergenfield Historical Association, during which time the History of Bergenfield was compiled. During the period of 1962 to 1966, he served the Bergenfield Police Athletic League; one year as Chairman of the Citizens' Committee. In 1963, he served as an active member of the Bergenfield Planning Board's Brook Survey Committee, and in 1967, he worked as a member of the Friends of the Library's special gifts committee. Since 1975, he has served as an alumni ambassador (advisor), encouraging Bergen and Hudson Counties high school students, capable of achieving, to attend Drexel University. Since 1972, he has been a member of the Bergenfield Lions Club, serving as director, treasurer and secretary. Currently, he serves as a member of the Lions District 16-A Hearing and Speech Action and Works with the Deaf Committee.

In his professional activities, from 1949 to 1970, he served the Power and Industrial Division of the New York Section of what is now the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers in all offices, including the Division Chairman. From 1972 to the present, he served the North Jersey Section of the IEEE in positions, including Section Secretary and Chairman. On an international level of IEEE, he has served on the Substation Committee since 1962. He has served as Committee secretary and has been elected

vice-chairman. From 1973 to 1978, he served as a member of the American National Standards Institute Committee C-29 Power Line Insulators and as chairman of a subcommittee on indoor insulators. A licensed professional engineer in New Jersey and formerly in New York and Pennsylvania, he was a member of the New York Chapter of the New York Society of Professional Engineers from 1950 to 1953 during which period he served one year as Financial Secretary. In 1953, he served as a member of the Young Engineers Committee of the National Society of Professional Engineers.

Norman A. Bleshman was born, raised and educated in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He received a B.S. in Electrical Engineering from Drexel University in 1947, and a MBA from Fairleigh Dickinson University in 1960.

From July 1947 to December 1947, he was employed by Birdsboro Steel Foundry & Machine Company in Birdsboro, Pa. From December 1947 to December 1955, he was employed by Ebasco Services, Inc. in New York, N.Y. Since December 1955, he has been employed by Public Service Electric and Gas Company and is currently Principal Staff Engineer.

He and his wife, Harriette resided in New Milford from August 1950 to August 1952 when they moved to their current home at 165 Ames Avenue in Bergenfield, N.J. They have two daughters Andree B. Rolfe of Ridgewood and Patricia of Bergenfield.

I am sure that my colleagues will join with me in extending our congratulations and appreciation to Mr. Bleshman for his outstanding achievements and in offering our best wishes for many more successes in serving the cause of our handicapped children.●

#### AMERICAN HANDGUN WAR DEAD

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, an additional 724 American lives were lost during the month of August as a result of the misuses of handguns. These deaths bring the total number of victims of the handgun war in 1980 to 5,238.

The handgun body count, which I have been inserting in the RECORD each month, is a listing of media-reported handgun deaths compiled by Handgun Control, Inc.

These disturbing figures indicate the necessity of an investigation by this body into the problem of the misuse of handguns. I hope that before the end of the 96th Congress, the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the legislation now pending that would work to curb the availability of handguns.

The handgun body count for August 1980 follows:

#### AMERICAN HANDGUN WAR DEAD—AUGUST 1980

ALABAMA (15)

I. Bentley, B. Bush, M. Gissendanner, B. Glover, L. Grizzard, J. Holmes, R. Jones, W. Kelly, C. Lowery, C. Mills, F. Pace, D. Pickens, M. Ricketts, F. Seldon, and B. Williams.

ARIZONA (16)

T. Conner, J. Cordova, N. Gannon, D. Garcia, D. Hilden, H. Howell, J. Howell, S. Jennings, M. Loney, A. Manfra, C. McNaughton, J. Triste, M. Turner, L. Wills, U. Wills, and R. Ziguores.

ARKANSAS (9)

R. Bearden, M. Carter, T. Christopher, J. Davis, O. Gatchell, Jr., T. Henry, R. Kight, P. Nash, Jr., and D. Piccirillo.

CALIFORNIA (94)

J. Aguirre, G. Ahulau, H. Alexander, S. Alvarez, G. Andrews, R. Avalon, I. Bishop, M. Booher, J. Campbell, S. Chavez, T. Chen, M. Corbis, V. Davis, D. Diaz, H. Dickey, S. Dickey, M. Earnshaw, J. Erke, M. Evans, A. Fiedler, M. Ford, and N. Garcia.

R. Garcia, C. Gearhart, W. George, A. Gonzales, F. Gonzalez, M. Grace, T. Hadley, M. Hatcher, D. Heard, R. Hendrix, L. Hernandez, S. Hernandez, L. Johnson, T. Jones, M. Kilgore, A. Lewis, D. Masters, T. Masters, T. Matsuda, and T. McKinney.

A. Medrano, A. Meza, B. Mitchell, D. Mitchell, H. Mitchell, O. Mondragon, M. Montealegre, U. Moon, R. Moreno, L. Ocon, G. Pearl, C. Punsalang, J. Ramos, F. Reynoza, J. Rios, B. Roberts, L. Rogers, W. Rogers, A. Rosa, and D. Rudnick.

R. Saunders, D. Seybert, M. Sherman, W. Simon, R. Soto, V. Southall, S. Spunar, P. Stewart, J. Stott, R. Urzua, I. Vega, J. Velasquez, V. Ventura, J. Vernin, R. Watkins, E. Watson, D. Westbury, B. Wheat, and B. White.

L. Wilson, M. Yu, unid. male, unid. female, unid. male, unid. male, unid. male, unid. female, unid. male, unid. male, unid. male, unid. female, and unid. female.

COLORADO (10)

G. Allison, B. Carlis, K. Chase, S. Fedak, B. Karr, J. Peterson, O. Petigo, J. Reed, and unid. male.

CONNECTICUT (4)

A. Goodrow, J. Koss, D. Tallon, and unid. male.

DELAWARE (1)

A. Skinner.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (4)

A. McKay, C. Smith, J. Strini, and N. White.

FLORIDA (35)

R. Bishop, G. Bullock, T. Castle, H. Copeland, Jr., K. Duggan, E. Dumois, J. Dumois, M. Dumois, C. Evans, J. Evans, O. Garcia, P. Gliedman, B. Gross, R. Hitolito, E. Huntton, C. Jones, R. Kates, D. Keel, D. Keller, C. Matanis, R. Matzke, L. Morales, M. Nowell, O. Ortega, R. Reyenger, F. Stanovitch, C. Stopford, L. Townsend, J. White, K. Woodard, P. Zingaro, unid. male, unid. male, unid. male, unid. male, and unid. male.

GEORGIA (15)

R. Hill, C. Marks, R. McClain, C. Postell, J. Prater, B. Price, C. Price, M. Redd, W. Ruffin, J. Smith, V. Smith, L. Wallin, A. Weaver, K. Welch, and H. Whitfield.

HAWAII (2)

W. Fergerson and D. Northway.

ILLINOIS (107)

G. Allen, R. Amaro, K. Anderson, R. Anderson, R. Andino, J. Baran, B. Bender, B. Bernat, R. Bradley, E. Branch, R. Brickman, A. Brown, N. Brown, R. Brown, M. Brown, S. Buode, W. Burns, D. Burroughs III, J. Butler, A. Carrillo.

R. Casillas, L. Cole, M. Cole, E. Collazo, P. Corbett, S. Cundiff, J. Dominguez, N. Drish, R. Drist, C. Ferrara, M. Figueroa, C. Florez, F. Foys, Jr., D. Fuller, A. Garcia, J. Garcia, K. Ghebemendhin, D. Goodman, O. Goodman, J. Green.



J. Haggains, F. Hernandez, E. Hills, C. Holzner, W. Hunt, P. Jackson, L. Jay, R. Jones, C. Kimborough, J. Lobb, L. Loeb, R. Loggins, E. Macon, N. Maffei, R. Magoon, M. Martin, A. Massey, M. McDonough, J. McDuffie, M. McGee, P. McGee.

E. McKinney, A. McNeal, A. Mellins, J. Mitchell, E. Morris, B. Murphy, L. Newson, J. Ortiz, R. Ortiz, W. Pass, K. Patterson, N. Perez, H. Pickett, E. Redie, S. Richards, J. Riley, J. Robinson, J. Rogers, D. Rudd, K. Rybski.

R. Salinas, C. Santy, S. Santy, J. Shrieve, J. Sierra, M. Sims, C. Smith, J. Smith, M. Smith, C. Stohn, Jr., D. Sweigart, I. Tarastuk, T. Tenort, E. Tolliver, V. Urquar, S. Vallejos, F. Vivar, D. Walker, K. Ward, M. Washington, W. Watkins, C. Weideman, R. Wilson, R. Yates, unid. male, and unid. male.

## INDIANA (13)

N. Alford, W. Eakins, C. Hankins, A. Jones, L. Lewallen, D. Quarles, D. Reynolds, W. Sieg, F. Sommerville, R. Stroutman, J. Teasett, J. Winslow, and unid. male.

## IOWA (2)

R. Brown and E. Toney.

## KANSAS (6)

E. Gasper, D. Heckert, G. Mayfield, K. Mebane, A. Watson, and unid. female.

## KENTUCKY (11)

E. Bell, A. Cox, T. Hatfield, L. Helphentine, J. Hudson, J. Huff, J. McKnight, R. Pennington, R. Smith, T. Smith, and D. York.

## LOUISIANA (36)

B. Adams, G. Adams, C. Bacque, E. Bloomer, C. Cottingham, K. Fruge, J. George, A. Hill, L. Holmes, C. Huntington, A. Irving, C. Lundy, H. Patterson, D. Peterson, O. Prieur, V. Purpera, Jr., J. Reliford, Z. Richardson, L. Rousseau, P. Schlitz, R. Sebble, E. Shaffer, G. Shoemaker, D. Simpson, B. Soingnet, H. Steele, Jr., J. Thibodeaux, C. Thrash, R. Tucker, G. Waltes, B. Wetmore, P. Wetmore, K. White, unid. male, unid. male, and unid. male.

## MAINE (2)

L. Pelletier and D. Pinette.

## MARYLAND (14)

J. Brimfield, J. Fetter, H. Floyd, Jr., V. Little, J. Mackie, W. Moore, E. Murphy, K. Paragis, S. Patton, N. Resnick, J. Stewart, J. Turner, J. Washington, and P. Watkins.

## MASSACHUSETTS (4)

S. Manigault, J. Pedro, W. Smith, and G. White, Jr.

## MICHIGAN (9)

C. Beavers, J. Blanks, M. Joshua, J. Keys, R. May, J. Perry, Jr., G. Smith, J. Steslicki, and P. Thelen.

## MINNESOTA (2)

H. Benedict and L. McPhee.

## MISSISSIPPI (2)

W. Cannon and J. Ethridge, Jr.

## MISSOURI (29)

E. Bolden, S. Boles, R. Brandenburg, T. Brummett, C. Bufford, J. Caudill, E. Collins, D. Danforth, D. Foulk, W. Franklin, S. Freeman, M. Harger, L. Hill, R. Jackson, R. Johnson, M. Kotsonis, R. Lewis, E. McCain, J. Myers, Jr., E. Richardson, B. Rodrian, B. Rose, T. Sanders, M. Stevens, J. Stewart, C. Timmerman, unid. male, unid. male, and unid. male.

## MONTANA (1)

D. Peterson.

## NEBRASKA (1)

L. Highley.

## NEVADA (3)

R. Kittle, B. Smick, and unid. male.

## NEW JERSEY (13)

T. Decesari, J. Diaz, C. Jefferies, C. Jones, A. Kennon, L. Mascalo, E. Moate, Jr., N. Pillaro, H. Sprague, T. Tomlinson, W. Tomlinson, H. Wilson, and unid. male.

## NEW MEXICO (6)

L. Bates, D. Chavez, M. McCoy, P. Montoya, L. Morrocco, and B. Stellato.

## NEW YORK (27)

V. Abril, A. Attianese, J. Consilio, L. DeJesus, C. Faust, S. Forbes, R. Foster, A. Fulton, E. Golston, L. Gonzalez, T. Hampton, G. Herrera, C. Lewis, L. Payce, D. Powell, J. Rivera, H. Rodriguez, J. Rodriguez, H. Ryman, M. Singh, A. Skinner, J. Smith, F. Stuhler, A. Vera, unid. male, unid. male, and unid. male.

## NORTH CAROLINA (26)

D. Adcock, D. Bundy, W. Coffey, J. Coles, Jr., K. Covington, T. Covington, C. Davis, W. Dixon, L. Dover, M. Dowdy, D. Eanes, S. Githens, B. King, K. Lee, T. Lomick, W. Mabe, G. Monroe, D. Murphy, K. Philbeck, M. Proffitt, S. Stewart, J. Taylor, L. Triplette, C. Wallace, C. Watkins, and J. Zavala.

## OHIO (21)

D. Barbee, P. Charles, J. Egbert, III, J. Green, Jr., B. Harris, P. Hayhurst, W. Holland, Z. Keffer, J. Malone, Jr., M. Levern, C. Milo, D. Mitchell, R. Murphy, K. Neiger, C. Rosenberger, O. Simms, L. Stroud, D. Taylor, D. Williams, A. Witcher, and A. Young.

## OKLAHOMA (12)

C. Berry, J. Carnes, C. Davis, L. Guzman, T. Hardman, W. Holmes, C. Jones, R. Kennedy, J. Smith, M. Smith, W. Stevenson, and unid. male.

## OREGON (5)

J. Ballance, D. Brunson, D. Coleman, E. Coleman, and M. Mock.

## PENNSYLVANIA (20)

R. Anderson, L. Berris, R. Cilas, F. Colon, G. Cragle, N. Fellman, G. Ferry, A. Petrow, R. Halrston, S. Huetter, W. Kling, R. Macdonald, R. Marenholtz, L. Mascolo, A. McKinney, S. Paul, J. Puerrile, W. Rice, Jr., D. Rodriguez, and K. Simmons.

## RHODE ISLAND (1)

L. Soto.

## SOUTH CAROLINA (6)

W. Dixon, L. Dover, T. Graham, D. McGill, L. Setzer, and J. Sullivan.

## TENNESSEE (27)

W. Binkley, J. Chaviers, L. Clemons, S. Dorsey, L. Duncan, W. Fiddler, A. Hamilton, M. Kinzer, A. Lowe, C. Lyle, D. Massa, J. Massa, J. Massa, Jr., D. Popovich, G. Pratcher, J. Price, R. Richardson, R. Seelye, W. Wallace, R. Westmoreland, A. Williams, R. Winfrey, C. Wooldley, P. Woodson, W. York, unid. male, and unid. male.

## TEXAS (87)

E. Acosta, F. Aranda, J. Avila, V. Barnett, J. Batchelor, R. Benavides, D. Bennett, K. Benton, T. Bradley, J. Brock, M. Brown, B. Burns, R. Camp, E. Castillo, C. Cavanaugh, B. Crisp, S. Crisp, R. Cruz, K. Davis, J. Dewbre.

B. Ellis, S. Francis, M. Garay, A. Gattison, W. Gibson, G. Gomez, J. Gonzales, S. Hall, R. Hatfield, J. Hayley, A. Hernandez, M. Herrera, J. Hicks, Jr., S. Ibarra, M. Jackson, O. Jones, E. Junious, J. Keen, J. Lewis, W. Lockhart.

J. Lovic, R. Lovic, J. Lynch, T. Martin, E. Mascorro, J. McGowan, R. Mesa, G. Morris, N. Morris, F. Muniz, S. Nuss, A. Olivares, F. Orona, Jr., A. Pacheco, Y. Pacheco, N. Perry, P. Poole, D. Porter, R. Prichard, J. Pritchard.

M. Quintanilla, M. Rainey, M. Reaves, A. Reinoso, J. Rios, N. Robertson, V. Rocha, Jr., D. Rogers, C. Rosales, D. Rubalcaba, C. Sauls, G. Schulte, S. Shackelford, B. Shaw, J. Solis, Jr., B. Staley, J. Tanton, R. Taylor, A. Tello, C. Trevino, H. Tyner, H. Tyner, Jr., P. Tyner, C. Vela, J. Voss, W. Wade, and K. Williams.

## UTAH (5)

M. Garcia, A. Magnuson, E. Sprinkle, unid. female, and unid. male.

## VIRGINIA (4)

C. Dodd, G. Housman, H. Labove, and J. Ponder.

## WASHINGTON (6)

A. Badillo, B. Ballard, W. Cleary, P. Collier, D. Fraley, and W. Touchstone.

## WEST VIRGINIA (4)

J. Conley, J. Fridley, J. Mace, and S. Mace.

## WISCONSIN (4)

S. Elerson, L. Roberts, T. Stublaski, and S. Walley.

## WYOMING (3)

D. Frank, S. Frank, and W. Judd.

## DEATHS PREVIOUSLY UNRECORDED

## January

## LOUISIANA

C. Boxley.

## MASSACHUSETTS

R. Valentine.

## NEW YORK

F. Rivera and M. Rivera.

## NORTH CAROLINA

R. Burrow.

## RHODE ISLAND

V. Dechristopher

## February

## ARKANSAS

C. Sargent.

## LOUISIANA

R. Griffin.

## NEW YORK

F. Almonte, and A. Morales.

## OHIO

W. Scott.

## TEXAS

D. Thomas.

## March

## ILLINOIS

R. Ivanov, M. Riordan.

## MASSACHUSETTS

C. Boucher.

## NORTH CAROLINA

W. Alexander.

## OREGON

R. Davenport.

## April

## IOWA

J. Van Haften.

## MISSISSIPPI

B. McDonald.

## OKLAHOMA

Unid. female.

## TEXAS

M. Hannalla.

## May

## FLORIDA

H. Sims.

## KENTUCKY

F. Dewitt.

## MAINE

C. Ledger.

OHIO  
L. Walker.

TEXAS  
E. Thompson, Sr.

June  
ALABAMA  
C. Sudduth.

ARIZONA  
D. Patton.

ARKANSAS  
R. McClung.

CALIFORNIA  
R. Chew, M. Comer, R. Horick, and J. Secor.

COLORADO  
J. Lutzow.

FLORIDA  
C. Dorsey, O. Ortiz, J. Rauley, and Unid. male.

IDAHO  
D. Hanes, B. Norton, and T. Schultz.

INDIANA  
E. Dodsens.

KANSAS  
C. Finley.

LOUISIANA  
W. Borne and S. Neal.

MICHIGAN  
G. Glass.

MISSOURI  
J. Reding.

NORTH CAROLINA  
R. McCauley.

NEW YORK  
D. Nemeroff and R. Steinberg.

OHIO  
J. Smith.

OKLAHOMA  
R. Jenkins.

PENNSYLVANIA  
A. McCutcheon and E. Parker.

TEXAS  
H. Allen, J. Alvarez, S. Barranco, B. Banks, E. Brown, P. Brown, W. Campell, D. Carr, B. Choate, G. Corona, A. Curry, L. Dickey, W. Edwards, C. Ferguson, N. Gill, J. Guajardo, R. Harrison, F. Johnson, L. Keaton, S. Moreno, A. Quiller, F. Roberts, H. Robinson, M. Shehata, A. Templeton, C. Villafuerte, J. Villanueva, R. Villanueva, and Unid. male.●

# H.R. 8117—SAFE DRINKING WATER AMENDMENTS

## HON. PHIL GRAMM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1980

● Mr. GRAMM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. WAXMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, and Mr. BROYHILL, ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for their strong roles in the formulation of H.R. 8117, as amended.

It would serve no purpose for me to present a recapitulation of the various provisions of the bill. Other Members have addressed themselves to that. To the extent that they have not, House Report No. 96-1348, in the main, provides a valuable supplement. Nevertheless, I propose to make some specific

observations about the principal sections of the bill.

Section 1, by extending the compliance deadlines under the exemption section of the Safe Drinking Water Act, lifts from communities the immediate anxiety flowing from the unbridled prosecutorial discretion which would have been reposed in EPA. At the same time it provides temporary protection from the increased threat of private suits which might have been filed upon the imminent demise of the existing deadlines.

Further, the exemption scheme of stretched-out compliance is available to systems without regard to whether they are large or small, public or private, so long as the States exercise their broad authority under the statutory requirements in good faith.

Regarding sections 2 and 3, I was the prime proponent—see section 1 of H.R. 6090—of different regulatory treatment for underground injections relating to oil and natural gas in recognition of the good record exhibited in the recent history of such operations in the major producing States.

The Administrator of EPA has maintained that all forms of underground injection must be regulated in some way under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Acting pursuant to that premise he has attempted to regulate oil- and natural-gas-related injections. I do not agree with his policy for two reasons. First, the overriding consideration for promulgation of minimum requirements is not that it be a form of underground injection, but rather that it be to prevent underground injection which endangers drinking water sources. Second, there are special limitations in any event on the promulgation of requirements for oil and gas operations. With respect to the latter objection, the historical record is itself a repudiation of the threshold essentiality of such requirements. Additionally, in light of the varying geologic, hydrological, and historical conditions in different States and in different areas within various States, the EPA requirements unnecessarily disrupt State underground injection-control programs. In short, the question is not merely whether the Federal regulations are reasonable in this area, but whether there should be Federal regulations at all. I believe that the answer is no on both counts.

After these regulations were promulgated, issue was joined by States and private parties under section 1448. There is nothing in section 2 or 3 of H.R. 8117 which would, in any way, jeopardize the appropriateness of a decision by a reviewing court that EPA's actions, findings, and conclusions respecting oil and gas operations, or any other classes of underground injections for that matter, were unlawful and should be set aside. Similarly, the likelihood that a reviewing court may postpone the effective date of an agency action or preserve status or rights pending conclusions of the

review proceedings to prevent irreparable injury, is not designed to be undercut at all by section 2 or 3.

Section 2 sets up a new section 1425, which merely allows an optional demonstration by States relating to oil and natural gas in lieu of that embodied by EPA promulgated regulations. It allows a State to be freed from EPA regulations so long as the State can demonstrate that its program meets certain existing statutory requirements set out for regulated underground injections. There is no guarantee that a State will choose to exercise its options under section 2 or that it will be able to make the requisite demonstrations. Of course, by prescribing an alternative discretionary course of action in section 2, it is not intended to sanction the course promulgated by the Administrator of EPA as being bottomed on a sustainable basis.

Section 2 is self-executing and as such requires no guidance documents or EPA regulations. The demonstration is an objective one in all cases, rather than a showing—or notice—satisfactory to the Administrator. As stated in the committee report, judicial review of a determination concerning an attempted demonstration is in accord with section 1448(a). Because review would not involve any regulations for States underground injection-control programs under section 1421, it would seem evident that review would be in accordance with paragraph (2) of 1448(a).

Under section 1425(b), if further demonstration is required, it is only with respect to an aspect of oil- and gas-related regulations which a revision or amendment addresses. In other words, the States do not have to constantly reargue points previously demonstrated unless it is necessary to the aspect at issue. Even then the aspect does not have to mirror EPA requirements either substantively or procedurally. The other aspects would have continued validity.

I believe that, based upon the testimony presented at hearings before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, the major producing States, at a minimum, would have no difficulty making a sufficient demonstration under section 1425.

Section 3, which excludes injection of underground natural gas storage from the definition of underground injection, is not intended by its specific exemption to include, by implication, all other forms of underground injection except to the extent authorized by the statute. Also, the exclusion is not meant to suggest that it was proper to so regulate natural gas storage absent the exclusionary language.

Last, I wish to emphasize that I do not intend to slacken my efforts to press forward for comprehensive changes in the Safe Drinking Water Act when it comes up for reauthorization in 1982.●



A TRIBUTE TO FRANK W. "PANCHITO" RAMIREZ, OF SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

## HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1980

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, celebrations of thanksgiving in honor of a fruitful harvest have been a California—and American—tradition since the days of the earliest settlers. As we enter the harvest season, I am especially honored to have been invited to the annual Grape Festival at Panchito's Restaurant in San Gabriel, Calif. I would like to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the owner of Panchito's, Frank W. "Panchito" Ramirez, a constituent of the 26th District of California. The community of San Gabriel has harvested the fruits of Frank's talent and generosity for more than a quarter of a century. In recognition of his leadership and service to the community, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives a brief summary of his background and accomplishments.

Frank Ramirez's father, Francisco Ramirez, worked in the copper mines of Arizona until he died of lung consumption at the age of 50. Left with nine children to raise, his wife Margarita, Maggie, moved to the barrio in East Los Angeles, where, against tremendous odds, she was successful in keeping the family together.

Maggie Ramirez taught each of her children that a person can survive under the most adverse conditions if they have the love of God, family, and country. Frank's mother strongly believed in the free enterprise system—a system that enables a person to work, save, and provide an education for the next generation. Throughout the years Mrs. Ramirez has continued to believe in these principles and has successfully instilled them in all of her children. She consistently repeated that "only in this wonderful country of the United States can a minority person succeed if the effort is made." Today, at age 90, Maggie continues to believe that to be an American of Mexican heritage is an asset, not a drawback.

Frank Ramirez is fifth in line in a family of four boys and five girls, eight of whom are still living. Frank's oldest brother, Jorge, a designer and builder of patios with an Hispanic flavor, is also a constituent of my congressional district, California's 26th. Demonstrating the spirit of Maggie Ramirez' children, Jorge's reputation for quality work has kept him at the same location in Alhambra, Calif., for 41 years. On October 3, 1980, Jorge will celebrate his 70th birthday. Even so, he still works 6 days a week and is always looking for new projects to enrich the Hispanic community.

With the examples set for him by his mother and older brother, Frank has continued the family tradition of hard work, community service and belief in the free enterprise system. He worked as a masonry contractor until 1956 when he decided that it was high time to stop building restaurants for other people and build one of his own. Frank's restaurant, "Panchito's," opened its doors later that same year.

During the opening ceremonies for Panchito's, the Rev. Father Montoya of the San Gabriel Mission Archangel blessed the establishment and gave Frank a slip of the Mission's Mother grapevine, which was planted in 1861. Frank planted the vine and over the years it has taken root and flourished until it now covers the entire patio area of the restaurant. The grapes from this vine, now ripe and ready for picking, will be harvested during Panchito's annual Grape Festival on October 5 of this year, 1980. By tradition the event is held on the second Monday in October.

Over the years, Frank and his wife Margie have worked tirelessly, giving of both time and money, to enhance and enrich the community of San Gabriel. He is a life member of the San Gabriel American Legion Post 748, where he was instrumental in the construction of the clubhouse. He is an active member of the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce, the Kiwanis Club, the Southern California Restaurant Association and the Southern California Visitors Council. Frank also supports junior American baseball.

Frank Ramirez has supported and raised funds for the City of Hope, poor families of Baja California, La Casa de San Gabriel, Retarded Children's Association, Women's Club, Muscular Dystrophy, Salisun High School, little league, and the Boys Club of San Gabriel.

He also supports the Sister City program of Celaya, Mexico, and, in addition to the Grape Festival, sponsors the annual Panchito's Golf Tournament to benefit the San Gabriel Boys Club.

Frank has served as a commissioner of dangerous drugs, as the president of El Adobe de Los Angeles State Historical Park Commission, as the president of the San Gabriel Fiesta Parade Association and as a member of the advisory council for the Los Angeles district attorney. He also served on the ad hoc committee for Los Angeles to establish the Plaza de Dolores, commemorating Mexican Independence Day, and has hosted the Mexican-American Businessmen's Luncheon for then Governor Ronald Reagan.

Frank has been as busy—and successful—with his restaurant as he has been in the community. Panchito's has expanded from 1,600 square feet to over 8,000 square feet. His staff has increased from 8 employees to more than 50, and the restaurant has grown from a single room seating 40 diners to a full-sized restaurant that accommo-

dates more than 300. It is a real family operation—Frank's son Robert serves as the executive chef for Panchito's and his son Richard is supervisor of the three Panchito Jr. quick-food restaurants.

Frank started his restaurant with recipes handed down through his family. His culinary creativity has expanded right along with the restaurant, and he now concocts his own award-winning dishes. He created a special dish for the famous radio/television chef Mike Roy called "Palomitas," and his "Steak Picado a la Panchito" is famous all over southern California. Panchito's has received the Pasadena Wine and Food Society Crown City Award, the Jerry Dicus Mr. Gourmet Award, and the Restaurant Writers' Association Award. The restaurant has also attained the coveted Holiday Magazine recommendation for 6 years. As Frank points out, "At Panchito's we are originators, not imitators. We dare to be different." Yet, Mr. Speaker, I would bring to the attention of my colleagues that Frank Ramirez has carried on the best tradition of the people of Mexican heritage. He has added immeasurably to the richness of our community, he has carried on the devotions of the Fathers of California's missions, ministering everywhere with his goodness and deep-rooted attachment to the State of California and the American way of life. I ask that my fellow Members in the U.S. House of Representatives join in this expression of thanks and extend with me every good wish as Frank W. "Panchito" Ramirez begins his 25th year in the restaurant business in San Gabriel, Calif. ●

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 30, 1980, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## OCTOBER 1

10:00 a.m.

## Government Affairs

## Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee

To oversight hearings on the implementation of certain programs of the General Services Administration.

3302 Dirksen Building

## OCTOBER 2

9:00 a.m.

## Judiciary

## Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee

To hold hearings to investigate alleged contacts between Robert L. Vesco and officers and employees of the United

States as contained in Judiciary Committee resolution agreed to July 23, 1980

9:30 a.m.

## Judiciary

## Limitations of Contracted and Delegated Authority Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the contracting-out procedures of consultants by the Federal Government.

5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

## Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of certain programs of the General Services Administration.

3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Subcommittee to hold an open business meeting on matters relating to its in-

2228 Dirksen Building

vestigation of individuals representing the interest of foreign governments.

6226 Dirksen Building

## OCTOBER 8

10:00 a.m.

## Select on Small Business

To hold hearings to review a proposal by the American Agricultural Investment Management Company on the investment of certain pension funds in farmland.

424 Russell Building

## OCTOBER 20

10:00 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

## Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review volunteer organization participation in Federal programs.

3302 Dirksen Building